

# METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, D.D., Editor.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE IDEAL CREED OF IAN MACLAREN. <i>J. J. Reed, S.T.D., Kingston, N. Y.</i>	345
II. THE MEANING OF PRAYER. <i>Professor John Bigham, Ph.D., De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.</i>	356
III. DID THE GAELIC CHURCH REVIVE PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATION? <i>Rev. C. C. Starbuck, Andover, Mass.</i>	365
IV. THE HUMAN BODY IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIANITY. <i>Bishop E. R. Hendrix, D.D., LL.D., Kansas City, Mo.</i>	389
V. WHY PREACHERS SHOULD STUDY BROWNING. <i>James Mudge, D.D., Lowell, Mass.</i>	403
VI. THE PERMANENT AND PROGRESSIVE IN HOMILETICS. <i>Professor R. T. Stevenson, Ph.D., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.</i>	415
VII. THE ATMOSPHERE AND THE PERSONNEL OF OXFORD UNIVERSITY. <i>Professor C. F. Sitterly, Ph.D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.</i>	429
VIII. HELEN HUNT JACKSON. <i>Rev. A. W. Armstrong, M.A., Garden Grove, Ia.</i>	444
<b>EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:</b>	
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS	451
The Supremacy of Social Questions, 453; The Law of Parsimony, 455.	
THE ARENA	464
"Did Paul Preach on Mars' Hill?" 464; The Humanity of Jesus, 466; The Deadly Parallel, 467; Dr. Crooks as Seen by His Students Ten Years Ago, 468; Theories of the Divine Government, 469; "Our Bible and Our Faith," 470.	
THE ITINERANTS' CLUB	471
New Methods of Ministerial Training, 471; The Intellectual Vigor of Old Men, 472; Unsound Criticism on Matt. xli, 40, 41, 474.	
ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH	476
The Babylonian Flood Legend, 476; The Time of the Exodus, 479.	
MISSIONARY REVIEW	480
Protestantism in Madagascar, 480; The Famine in India as a Missionary Opportunity, 481; The Statement of Christian Doctrine in Mission Countries, 482; Japanese in Transition, 482; The Plague at Bombay, 483.	
FOREIGN OUTLOOK	484
SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES	490
BOOK NOTICES	494

NEW YORK:  
EATON & MAINS.  
CINCINNATI:  
CURTS & JENNINGS.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

*Amthman Jackson*

## You wasn't ready

when your skeptical friend asked you what good the Churches do anyway. Be ready the next time you are questioned to show that your own Church is one of the most important factors in the uplifting of humanity in this country. Its Missionary Society stands behind the heroes who preach the Gospel to willing hearers in all the sparsely settled districts. Its Board of Church Extension is building three churches a day, every one of which stands for good government in its vicinity. Its Freedmen's Aid Society has a splendid belt of well-equipped schools throughout the South-land. Its Board of Education takes the young men who have plenty of grit, but no money, and sees that they get the longed-for education. Its Sunday School Union is constantly founding new schools, in which great armies of children get their first bent in the right direction. Its Tract Society exerts an influence for good which cannot be measured in the millions of pages of tracts it circulates annually. Its Book Concern provides the most desirable books for general reading and study, for the home library, and for the Sunday school, at the lowest possible prices. The figures to back these points, and which you and every other Methodist should have within easy reach, are contained in **THE METHODIST YEAR BOOK** for 1897, edited by Dr. Sanford. Price, 10 cents. Postage, four cents additional.

---

## Literature of Theology.

By BISHOP HURST.

**THE INDEPENDENT** says: "This manual is a boon to students of theology. It gives no foreign titles and no critical, comparative, or descriptive notes; but it contains all the best works on theology published in the English language in America, Great Britain, and Canada, and most of the leading religious works."

8vo. 757 pages. \$4, net.

---

**EATON & MAINS, PUBLISHERS, 150 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.**  
**CURTS & JENNINGS, CINCINNATI, O.**







# METHODIST REVIEW.

---

MAY, 1897.

---

## ART. I.—THE IDEAL CREED OF IAN MACLAREN.

THOSE who are acquainted with the writings of Dr. John Watson, of Liverpool, under the *nom de plume* of "Ian Mac-laren," will promptly concede the singular talent, not to say the genius, of the man. His remarkable literary gifts—too tardily discovered, even by himself—have fairly flashed before an admiring gaze. We have eagerly read his most realistic portrayal of Scotch scenery and character. His little volume, *Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush*, commands the admiring, rapt attention of all classes of readers. We have lately had some further glimpses of Scotch wisdom and wit in *The Cure of Souls*, and now he issues for the more thoughtful his *Mind of the Master*.

In character-study, in vivid word-painting, in sly and dry humor, and in tear-compelling pathos he rightly belongs to the latest constellation of Scotland's star writers, and, it may be, star preachers. There is no question as to the literary brilliancy of this gifted man. Some, however, are raising the question of his doctrinal clearness and soundness. His warm human sympathies are most pleasingly evident in his study of the manly character and self-sacrificing career of the hero-physician, Dr. Maclure. It is undoubtedly an inspiration to a noble, self-forgetful life to have known, even in the pages of acknowledged romance, so sturdy yet so sweet a specimen of toilsome, faithful manhood. Lachlan Campbell, one of Mac-laren's characters, is the exponent of a cast-iron creed and of a mere mechanical theology. He is censorious and severe in his

judgments and exactions. His was a false idea of God and truth. With the incoming of a great sorrow came new light. "The Transformation of Lachlan Campbell" is one of the most touching pen-pictures to be found in religious literature. We have this character before us as we proceed with a task by no means pleasant, hoping to clear the atmosphere and satisfy honest doubt.

But let us turn to *The Mind of the Master*. There is really so much to admire in this masterful exaltation of the claims of the Christ, so much of genuine love for Jesus, that we regret that there seems to be anything to forbid unqualified approval. In order the better to understand Dr. Watson's position we must remember his own discriminations. They are not always consistent. If he says, in one place, "Theology is the science of religion," he says, elsewhere, "Theology has one territory which is theory; religion has another which is life." Sin is selfishness. With self-renunciation man ceases from sin. If the experience of the new birth is needed, this is not emphasized, and does not prominently appear. Dr. Watson inveighs against "that solitary creed which has raised uncharitableness into an article of faith." For this we will not chide him. The trend of his thinking and theology is apparent from his confessed admiration. They are the key, in part, to the interpretation of his teaching. He says, frankly, "The disciples of Jesus owe a debt that can never be paid to three men that have brought us back to the mind of our Master. One was Channing, for whose love to Jesus one might be tempted to barter his belief; the second was Maurice, most honest and conscientious of theologians; and the third was Erskine of Linlathen, who preached the fatherhood to everyone he met, from Thomas Carlyle to Highland shepherds." Dr. Watson is an exponent and champion of the "new theology." He is representative of the Broad Church idea—the progressive orthodoxy, it may be called, of his branch of the Church in Great Britain.

As such he has given us a passage, among others of like liberal character, in *The Mind of the Master*, which affords special warrant for not unkindly criticism. We venture the suggestion that the passage seems to call for further expansion, or, at least, for some qualification. As it stands it seems to be crude, immature, and incomplete, regarded

from a theologic point of view, however fresh and pleasing may be the rhetorical simplicity of its phrasing. It is: "I believe in the fatherhood of God; I believe in the words of Jesus; I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life; I believe in the Beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies, and to seek after the righteousness of God." The conviction of Dr. Watson, ever borne in mind by him in all his study of the mind of the Master, is this: "There is nothing on which we differ so hopelessly as creed; nothing on which we agree so utterly as character." It is this conviction which affords us so much that is inspiring and elevating in his work. But it is this, also, however much we may admire the independence, not to say the originality, of the man, which makes him liable to the suspicion of erroneous teaching. We understand him to be the outspoken foe of mere traditional teaching, of theologic dogma, and of metaphysical subtlety of every kind. He exalts the value of being, in contrast with believing. He prefers the possession of a true-hearted Christian character to the profession of the most exact Christian creed. Holy living with him, as with all good men, is paramount in importance with sound thinking. Yet the brilliant Scotchman, in his chapter on "Fatherhood the Final Idea of God," himself insists that the "first equipment for living is a creed."

We do not wish to misrepresent Dr. Watson. His spirit is most genial; his heart is most philanthropic; his loyalty to Christ and to the teachings of Christ, as he honestly interprets those teachings, is most exemplary. His love for his Master is seen at its best in the beauty, and even pathos, of his admirable chapter on "Devotion to a Person the Dynamic of Religion." We simply raise the question whether his ideal creed is as ideal as the very cream of all the creeds should be, both ethically and spiritually. Moreover, we do not criticise this so-called life-creed altogether in the light in which Dr. Watson honestly intended it, so much as in the view in which it is likely to be received. To know his real meaning it will not do to take his ideal creed entirely by itself. We must see it in its literary framework. We must consider it illumined by the sidelights afforded by the fifteen chapters of his thoughtful and stimulating book. But, even in this painstaking effort to be unprej-

undiced and impartial, we find that this imaginary creed is still shadowed by serious doubts. The passage is liable, we fear, to be misapprehended as a substitute for all the creeds of Christendom. We are assured that Dr. Watson really "offers it as an interpretation of them." If this be so, may it not justly be urged that this interpretation needs to be interpreted? To say nothing about the great cardinal doctrines comprehended in all the great historic creeds, here purposely eliminated, what shall we say of some of the affirmations themselves? Can it be claimed that they are either clear or comprehensive? Is it not evident that some of them are ambiguous? May not such an "interpretation" be, in effect, unscriptural, insufficient, and misleading?

Take, for example, the affirmation, "I believe in the fatherhood of God." So far as the unregenerate are concerned, may this not point to a fanciful sentiment, rather than to a scriptural truth? Is it, or is it not, the mere echo of Pope's "Universal Prayer?"

Father of all! in every age,  
In every clime adored,  
By saint, by savage, and by sage,  
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

The prayer which our Lord taught his immediate disciples began, it is true, with "Our Father which art in heaven." It was in a message to his disciples only that Jesus said, "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father." And is it not the explicit teaching of Scripture that we are God's children by adoption, or through the process of the new birth? Did not our Lord say, speaking to the Pharisees, "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do?" Both John the Baptist and the gentle Jesus characterized them further as a "generation of vipers." Was this empty vituperation? Or was it not exact classification? In view of their real, inner character, the hypocritical Pharisee and Sadducee, according to the verdict of Omniscience, belonged to the serpent brood. Their genealogy is, with one swift glance, traced back to "that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." Did not Paul qualify the idea of God's possible fatherhood in the words, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus?" But what does Dr. Watson mean



when, in his last chapter, he persistently affirms, "Two finds have been made within recent years, the divine fatherhood and the kingdom of God?" Dr. James McCosh, in *The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral*, speaks of Scotland as possessing an "intellect as hard as its rocks;" but excepting when he speaks of "the sentimental view of God" he may have the view of Dr. Watson remotely in mind, we shall discover nothing, even in the way of allusion to what the latter is pleased to claim as a "new find."

For many years, in the narrow thought of one school of theology, only the elect were warranted in calling God Father. Now the pendulum of belief has swung to an opposite extreme. The modern idea with many, even in Calvinistic circles, is likely to be much too broad. The secret thought, and even public teaching, of many is that the fatherhood of God is not a strictly spiritual, but rather a constitutional, relation; that, good or bad, we are "his offspring;" and that the relation is in no wise dependent either on the grace of God or on compliance with what once were regarded as necessary conditions prescribed in God's word. The doctrine of the divine sovereignty, even among Calvinists, is fast giving place to that of the sovereign fatherhood of God.\* The divine government is pronounced to be purely paternal. The claim is made by some that we become the children of God only as we realize his fatherhood, and that the expressions, "children of the evil one" and "children of disobedience," represent simply an aspect of life, and not a fact of nature. If this claim is just it needs to be more plainly verified. Can it be proved by the word of God? The condition of sonship in the professed believer and the recognition of his own fatherhood, on the part of God, are plainly stated and are insisted upon in the New Testament Scripture. Only those who are Spirit-born and Spirit-led are the sons of God. There must be, in a sense, a certain separation from the world, or we have no encouragement to appropriate the conditional assurance, "I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Paul says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." This witness is to a marvelous change, a change

\* *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, by A. M. Fairbairn, p. 444.

of condition, and a change of relation. But if we are the children of God by natural constitution where is the significance of this Scripture, and what becomes of the doctrine of assurance?

No argument for the universal fatherhood of God can, we think, be based on the absolute, yet occult, relation which Christ, the Son, sustains preeminently to the first person of the Trinity. As Abraham is spoken of as the "father of the faithful," so, in a real but infinitely exalted sense, is God the father only of those who have been "born from above." Is it conceivable that God was the father of Judas, the betrayer, in the same sense that he was the father of John, the beloved; or that he was the father of the impenitent multi-murderer, H. H. Holmes, in the same sense that he was of the spiritually-minded Madame Guyon? We are being forced to face the seemingly needless question, In what view is the true Christian distinctively "a child of God?" If we universalize the fatherhood of God, why should it not extend to all the created intelligences in the entire universe—to the angels, bad as well as good—and so, at last, to Satan himself? If this, in any sense, is a *reductio ad absurdum*, is it not the evident consequence of a confusion of ideas? God is, by revelation, the almighty Maker of all men, the rightful Ruler of all men; but is he necessarily, therefore, the Father, in any well-defined sense, of all men? In the reaction from the old-school teaching of God's rigid and relentless sovereignty must the new-school teaching swing entirely over to the other extreme of God's all-inclusive, indiscriminating, fatherly love? Is there no middle ground which is tenable? Must those of the Scotch school of theology, who revolt from the sterner teaching of John Calvin and John Knox, find their final resting place, by even remote possibility, in the creed of Hosea Ballou, or of James Freeman Clarke? To steer between the Scylla of Calvinism, on the one side, and the Charybdis of Universalism, on the other side, may still be the peculiar province of pilots of the Arminian faith.

If we are assured once in the Old Testament that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him," we are likewise assured, and that repeatedly, in the New Testament, that Christ is "the only begotten of the Father." In this view we see a definiteness of statement in the Apostles'

Creed which admits of no misunderstanding: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, . . . and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord." It is a striking admission on the part of Dr. Watson that neither prophets nor psalmists were ever "so carried beyond themselves as to say 'My Father.'" The creature, then, is not necessarily the child. The possible fatherhood of God to the believer, through the work of the regenerating Spirit, is one of the plain revelations of the divine Son of God. In all the systems of divinity—those greater interpretations of the mind of the Master with which we may happen to be acquainted—regeneration is ever the ground of sonship. Did not John the evangelist say, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God?" Will the genial author of *The Mind of the Master* claim, in rebuttal, that these are the words of John, but not "the words of Jesus?"

We have no "dogmatic ends to serve." Yet it is by no means so plain to some as it appears to be to Dr. Watson that Jesus had "no exoteric word for his intimates." What was hid from the wise and prudent was revealed to babes—babes in Christ—the children of God. The "universal note in Jesus's teaching" is not so obvious to some as it is to this gifted author. Even he admits that "it would not be fair to rest any master doctrine on a single parable," as that of the prodigal son. We have a sort of hermeneutic restriction which appeals to our good sense: "A parable must not be made to walk on all fours." It may be overworked. An old school of typical or allegorical teaching would convert a parable into a theological centipede. In this view, even the parable of the prodigal son may yet have to be reconsidered. To speak of the sonship of the sinner as a divine possibility is one thing. It is for this we contend. To speak of it as a relation which is actual and real, while a man is yet "dead in trespasses and sins"—this is quite another claim. This view we feel constrained to oppose. Does not Dr. Watson himself at last unguardedly surrender it? Does David say, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth" all human kind? "Like as a father" expresses the idea

of similarity only. Are not the qualifying words, "them that fear him," filled with restrictive meaning? We have long thought that even supposed orthodoxy has been corrupted, insensibly but too really, by the insidious teachings of Universalism. The drift of things, in these closing days of the nineteenth century, is toward doctrinal laxity, and hence toward ethical lawlessness. Not only are the words of inspiration thus suspected, but the books of the Bible are being repudiated. A too apprehensive Church may yet take up a wail similar to that of the afflicted Jacob, "Moses is not, and Daniel is not, and will ye take Jonah away? All these things are against me."

The necessary limits of this brief critique will not admit of a full discussion of the question of the divine fatherhood in its various aspects and with its scriptural limitations. In any view there are difficulties to be faced and differences to be feared which may not readily be reconciled. Children, we believe, are recipients of all the benefits of the atonement. As John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost" from the hour of his birth, each infant may be the subject of the latent regenerating grace of God, and so remain a child of God until, by conscious sin, it falls from grace. Yet Dr. Austin Phelps, writing on the work of the Holy Spirit, finds grave difficulties; and Dr. John Miley said in his class room at Drew Seminary, in answer to an inquiry: "I frankly concede the profound mystery, and as frankly admit I have no light to give. Nor have I been able to receive light from others. The fact of infant salvation, in case of death, I do not question. But its philosophy is a mystery as yet without solution."

If we have dwelt at some length on the first affirmation of Dr. Watson's imagined new creed we may be excused in the view of his own statement: "It is open to debate, indeed, whether Jesus said anything absolutely new, save when he taught the individual to call God Father." Yet, with Dr. Watson, "the words of Jesus" constitute the true evangel; the utterances or acts of the apostles are comparatively of little worth. In his estimation the epistles lack directness, if not authority. They are not regarded by him as of equal inspiration or accuracy with the reported words of the Master. However presumptuous or profane it may seem, even to this author, he does not hesitate to hint at imperfections in the apostle to the Gentiles,

or to criticise his style, his illustrations, his doctrine, and his spirit. Dr. Watson, it must be admitted, does this in loyal insistence upon the supreme excellences of the great Teacher. It may be this fact, with others, was not charitably borne in mind by the ministry of a certain city, who felt called upon publicly to repudiate the doctrinal teaching of even so brilliant a writer as Ian Maclaren. And, just here, is it not a somewhat unexpected admission which the author makes, "The lonely supremacy of Jesus rests not on what he said, but on what he did?"

"I believe in the words of Jesus." This seems an affirmation moderate and comprehensive enough, perhaps. In one view it certainly is. For Christ claimed, "I and my Father are one." But—as another has already noted—many a Unitarian will affirm that he believes the words of Jesus who will nevertheless resolutely reject the claim he makes to be divine. If one says Dr. Watson intended this second affirmation to include all Christ said about his sacrificial atonement as being the divine Son of God—the one Mediator between God and man—and other lofty spiritual teachings, then why not make this single affirmation all-inclusive? Why should not the ideal creed be, simply and only, "I believe in the words of Jesus?" This would include all that is theologic and ethical. Why proceed with the remaining affirmations of belief? Yet he further says—we think needlessly—"I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life." This may be all true, beautiful, and good, both in thought and in expression, but we look in vain for any recognition of the person and work of the Holy Spirit; and, while we do not wish to be understood as implying that a belief in the Holy Ghost is no part of Dr. Watson's own creed, we do wish to express our surprise that, in the highly spiritual and ideal creed which he "imagines," the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has no place. We have here also no word concerning repentance, though Christ's first public deliverance seems to have been, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Again, why say, "I believe in the beatitudes," and not say, "I believe in the Ten Commandments?" "Are not the beatitudes indeed the "words of Jesus?" Are the Ten Commandments—sufficiently ethical, it would seem—to be regarded as abrogated? And are the beatitudes, by implication, all that is left by a sort

of destructive criticism of our Lord's more lengthened majestic discourse? The moral elevation and the spiritual heroism which Dr. Watson sees in the beatitudes alone are most attractive. His paraphrases and eulogiums are fresh with new life and eloquent with fine feeling. Yet we are confident our author's full meaning is not included in the brief words he employs, by way of ideal creed, concerning even the beatitudes. He elsewhere claims that the Sermon on the Mount is the authoritative creed of the Christian Church, the divine constitution of the kingdom of heaven. He also says, "The ten words are only eclipsed by the law of love." It is with this in mind, then, that he speaks of the "service of love." He has had the "courage to formulate an ethical creed," it is true. But is there not an underlying fallacy in the "stand" which he takes and on which he conceives an ethical creed should be based? Was the Sermon on the Mount the only deliverance of our Lord? Are there not other "words of Jesus" which were uttered supplementary to this first public discourse? Did Christ ever intimate that this first sermon was substitutional for all other scriptures—that it was so comprehensive and complete that there was no need of any further deliverance on his part?

Dr. Watson's views, we repeat, while sufficiently broad, are likely, in the light of this ideal creed alone, to be somewhat widely misunderstood. If it is urged that the creed imagined by Dr. Watson is intended to be a purely ethical creed, then we must object that belief in the divine fatherhood or in the words of Jesus is not purely ethical, whatever else may be fairly insisted upon. The broad view of Dr. Watson, if we rightly represent him, is a new departure in theologic thought. Orthodoxy, so called, has never entertained it. It has had neither the respect nor the recognition of the great Church councils—which Dr. Watson himself admits—nor of the great representatives, individually, of theologic learning or authority. Calvinism, as interpreted by Charles Hodge, is antagonistic to it. Arminianism, as interpreted by John Miley, gives it no countenance.

We need say little more. However unimportant it may seem to some, we think we have made good our point that the passage referred to is neither a good substitute for any of the great symbols of the Christian Church, nor is it a fair interpretation of their choicest spiritual meaning. It lacks the dig-



nity that would commend it to the favorable consideration of a "congress of all religions," the comprehensiveness that would receive the indorsement of Christian scholars, and the evident scripturalness and spirituality that would satisfy the simple-hearted believer. We can only conclude that what some of us have esteemed to be necessary forms of belief hitherto are thought by Dr. Watson to be altogether unimportant, and hence, in his view, have no place in the Christian's conception of what an ideal creed should be.

It may be thought by some that this brief critique is too moderate. By others it may be regarded as severe. Which-ever judgment may be passed, we have sought to be appreciative, tolerant, and fair. Whatever we may think of Dr. Watson's ideal creed, we will admire, not only the genius, but the actual Christian character, of the man. We do not say that he even inclines to the acceptance of Universalist or Unitarian ideas. But we do say that, in the light of his so-called creed and of at least one chapter in his book, his doctrinal meaning is not perfectly clear, and may be used in the propagation of error. Nor are the best results to be obtained by mere expedients or by the spirit of compromise. We are sure that nothing can be hoped for by timid surrender. True evangelistic leadership will insist upon the recognition of the "exceeding sinfulness of sin," of the need and efficacy of a sacrificial atonement, and of the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost. Concerning these Dr. Watson has but little to say.

John J. Reed.

## ART. II.—THE MEANING OF PRAYER.

ALL men are in their way theologians. Everyone has some deity at whose shrine he bows in prayer. It may be a false god, a deified ancestor whose failings are hid by a halo of reverence, or even the sun, moon, stars, or other natural objects and forces. It may be the true God, whose unseen power is manifested in righteousness and benevolence. The fact of prayer, of adoration to some deity, true or false, is a significant phase of human history and life.

A glance at the religious history of the world shows the universality of prayer. In ancient India over two thousand years ago petitions were chanted by the Vedic priests—hymns of propitiation to Indra, the sky god; of thanks to Agni, the fire god; of fear to Varuna, the great destroyer; and tenderly beautiful supplications to Yama, the god of death. The temples of old Egypt, dedicated to Osiris, god of the dead; to Amen, giver of victory; to Ra, the sun god; and to Ptah, the creator, resounded with entreaties to their patron deities. In the Western world the Aztecs in ancient Mexico brought tribute and human sacrifice to Mexitli and to Quetzalcoatl, god of benevolence. From the altars of classic Greece incense arose through many centuries to Athene, the wise; Zeus, the thunderer; Poseidon, the sea god; Apollo, the princely healer; and Aphrodite, the foam-born beauty; and votive offerings enriched the shrines of the oracles of Delphi, Lesbos, and Dodona. The Romans, with all their genius and endurance, owed their conquests as much to prayer as to warfare. They had their Lares and Penates, gods of the home and family; Vesta, goddess of the quenchless hearth fire; Trivia, goddess of the streets; Jove and Juno, Mars and Venus, Neptune, Pluto, and Bacchus; naiads and nymphs, fauns and satyrs; a deity for every place and condition, to which the devout Romans offered fervent and frequent prayer. Our nearer ancestors, the ancient Saxons and Norsemen, held communion with the mighty Thor, ruler of storms and thunder; with the gentle and beautiful Balder, god of summer; with Frey, giver of rain and harvests and peace; and with Odin, the great all-father. And savage tribes, Indians of America, idolatrous blacks of Central Africa, fetich worshipers

of the sea islands, these and all other peoples have gods to which they offer a sincere but benighted adoration. And the true God has never lacked worshipers. The Hebrews, with clearer insight than their polytheistic neighbors in Chaldea, Assyria, and Egypt, prayed to him as El Shaddai the mighty; as Elohim Sebaoth, God of the hosts of heaven and earth; as Jehovah, the living one. And the petitions spoken with incense and sacrifice at the altars of Israel yielded at last to the purer prayers of the early Christians, to spiritual communion with the great Comforter. Thus in prayer the Church was founded by Christ and extended by Paul and his brethren. In prayer its missions were spread from India to Britain. In prayer the martyrs died in the arena. In prayer the Church councils were held. In prayer battles have been fought and nations founded. In prayer Luther established Protestantism, Columbus claimed the New World for Spain and the Church, and the Huguenots and Puritans sought the freer life of the Western world.

Prayers rise incessantly in the daily life of the world. To-day, as in ancient times, the Brahman priests supplicate hideous idols, and Buddhists in Japan tie their paper petitions to the lattice screens at the shrines of the great Gautama. Many times daily the muezzin calls the faithful of Islam to prayers, and many millions of worshipers still bow before gods of metal, wood, and stone. In Christian nations prayer is offered in public meetings and on national occasions. Congress and legislatures have their chaplains and services. In educational institutions prayer has a permanent place. Universities, colleges, academies, and some public schools have stated times for it. In the religious world it is a vital part of the regular services, Sabbath school, official and social meetings, and is peculiarly prominent in the weekly prayer meetings. It enters into domestic life, as family prayers or as the blessing at meals, and is part of the personal experience of all believers.

A fact so prevalent in the history and life of the world must command the attention and interest of every thoughtful mind. It seems a just claim that everyone, whether a Christian or not, should have an intelligent understanding of the meaning of prayer. All prayers are petitions from a worshiper to a deity. In the church services the minister says, "Let us unite in prayer." The worshipers then kneel, or stand, or bow their

heads. All eyes are closed. The preacher, in a similar attitude, with clasped hands, leads them in prayer. In subdued tones, which may sometimes tremble with emotion or rise in throbs of supplication or melt in fervent thanksgiving, he talks to this invisible and inaudible Being, which he addresses as "God," or "Lord," or "Our Father in heaven," or "Almighty God." His words guide the thoughts of the listening people. He prays for the "sick and afflicted," for "those weak in the faith," for the unconverted, for all good causes, such as the Church, Christian temperance, Christian education, and missions. He confesses and asks forgiveness for the sins of his people and of the world. After speaking thus for a short time he ascribes holiness, glory, and power to this supreme Being, and says, "All this we ask in Christ's name," or merely uses the phrase "for Christ's sake," and then closes with the word "Amen," a Hebrew adverb meaning "firmly," "certainly," "so be it." Then the congregation resume the ordinary position in the pews, and the service proceeds. An act so unique as this communion of a sinful human being with an infinitely holy Deity suggests various queries which may perhaps be answered by scrutinizing prayer from several points of view:

I. The psychological. The act of prayer is the culmination of normal mental conditions. One who prays does so because he cannot help it. He is in mental distress which demands relief. Into that desert land of the self, where each of us dwells in loneliness, has suddenly flashed a revelation of weakness, selfishness, and guilt; and far away on the heights of consciousness the dweller sees a splendor of unattained possibilities. And toiling toward this transfiguration of his latent powers his futile struggles declare his need of One who, knowing infinitely better than he the hidden dangers of the psychic wilderness, can guide him aright. This Guide can be no other than the supreme mind, God. For all other finite minds are making the same weary journey. Prayer, therefore, is the spontaneous yearning for the Companion. And, as the brilliant and genial Professor James aptly says, "The impulse to pray is a necessary consequence of the fact that, whilst the innermost of the empirical selves of a man is a self of the social sort, it yet can find its only adequate Socius in an ideal world."\* Thus, in

\* *Psychology*, p. 192. New York, 1892.

prayer, the petitioner communes with the ideal Self whose holiness he vainly strives to realize. His sorrows and longings are understood, and his burdens are lightened, because his secrets are known, by an infinitely compassionate Friend.

The act of prayer involves some definite and important psychic processes. The habit of prayer is an advantage and a danger. Habitual prayer is easier, and by care and accompanying works may become a controlling power in every life. But it is liable to degenerate into a subconscious routine, like eating and walking, and its efficacy is thereby endangered. The mind that would commune with its Companion must be properly secluded. The quiet Sabbath, free from the turmoil of business; the evening hour, after the cares of the day; the sanctuary, from whose dim light all harsh sounds and sights are excluded; the worshiper's closed eyes and subdued tones are requisites for shielding the spirit from the disturbances of sense. In true prayer the attention must be directed to God. Thus, only by effort can there be access to the divine consciousness. Grouping its petitions around some definite need, daily noticing new beauty in the changes of Christian experience, finding the shock of disappointment only a stimulus to closer scrutiny of failings and possibilities, all valid prayer requires voluntary attention. Those who pray are led to greater delicacy of moral discrimination. The holiness and sin, the gold and dross, the slime and cleanness in others and in himself, stand out in their true proportions and vividness when seen through the correcting transparency of prayer. Viewed through its achromatic purity, the pomp and glory of the world vanish, its colors fade, its great dwindle, mammon's jewels become bangles and its robes tatters, Rome is a wilderness and Nazareth an empire, Caesar a servant and Paul dictator, and the despised Galilean is King of kings. The last is first and the first last, death is life, prosperity is doom, the tipsy world grows sober, and superficial contrasts disappear when by prayer we discern amid life's seeming chaos the dominant purpose of the great Judge who judges all things well. In prayer the scope of this purpose is revealed. By the silent, swift bonds of association the remotest and minutest objects and events are united into a spiritual system wherein the meaning of the world is more clearly seen. In suggestive influence

upon a wavering mind a dewdrop may outweigh the ocean ; a casual greeting may do more than a learned dissertation ; a name, a touch, a familiar refrain may reach the hidden springs of life. The wings of lowly faith sweep in association from India to China, Africa, Armenia ; from Rome to Ephesus ; from David to Christ ; from doubt to faith ; from Calvary's cross to the heavenly throne, and take many a refreshing journey in the realms of spirit. Memory, too, darkens or chastens the present with recollections of past failures or blessings. Imagination secures through prayer an insight into the ideal world. It shows us the gates of pearl, the precious streets, and jeweled corridors leading to the great white throne. It sees there the ineffable radiance of the thorn-crowned King, the chanting choirs of cherubim and seraphim, and the adoration of the white-robed kneeling throngs of the redeemed. And, borne on their melodious hosannas, it transports us away from all the crudity of earthly longings.

Further, all prayer is rational, an intelligent and normal act. By reason we pass from the things seen, which are temporal, to the things unseen, which are eternal ; and the concrete world of houses and trees, books and furniture, men, weather, sky, earth, stars, universities, battles, debates, newspapers, and money, resolves into a few simple facts and principles—a holy God and a sinful soul ; after sin, forgiveness or condemnation ; after life, death ; after death, judgment ; after judgment, heaven or hell—and these are the essentials of life. Obscured in ordinary living, they stand clearly revealed in prayer. The emotional nature is preeminent in prayer. Throbs of remorse for sin, gratitude at forgiveness, grief and reverence, fear and entreaty ; anger, doubt, and despair ; wonder, awe, and peace ; the exultation of Miriam's triumphant song, Elijah's thanksgiving for rain, David's penitence, Simeon's rejoicing, Christ's agony in Gethsemane, and over all the love that passeth understanding—all these find a true and necessary place in communion with the living God. The deepest psychological significance of prayer is its volitional nature. The bended knee, bowed head, and clasped hands fitly express the submissive will, which has listened to the inner voice, has deliberately chosen God, has renounced self, and has determined upon a new life. Thus it was that the



publican cried, "God be merciful to me a sinner;" and the persecutor on the Damascus road, in his crushed zeal and broken purpose, asked, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And the volitional element in prayer is consummated by the "Amen" of consent, the fiat of the worshiper.

II. The metaphysical. A psychological analysis of prayer is inadequate. Psychology at best is only a natural science, and—like chemistry, with its atomic theory, astronomy, with its nebular hypothesis, and all other natural sciences—it rests upon unproven assumptions, and all its explanations are provisional. A clearer understanding of prayer requires the aid of metaphysics, which defines it as a special relation between the absolute and the finite spirit. The nature, method, and results of this relation may be determined, as involving the categories of personality, being, and relation. The relation of the worshiper to God in prayer is the "second personal" relation of communion or direct address. As a scientist the theologian studies about God, as a worshiper he is acquainted with him. The fact of prayer presupposes that the same essential nature is characteristic of deity and worshiper. The Universal and the particular are therefore spirits whose reciprocity of life is the choice of both, and the fulfillment of the conditions which make prayer valid is the duty of the suppliant. The method whereby the particular secures audience with the Universal is peculiar. The two are radically distinct—finite and infinite, creature and Creator, sinful and holy, ignorance and omniscience, weakness and omnipotence, limitation and absoluteness, human and divine. Prayer bridges this dualism by a third element possessing the essence of both Absolute and conditioned. This mediation must be the Universal particularized, the absolute idea uttered in a finite form, the eternal Logos incarnate, the servant of Jehovah, Jesus the Christ. In his name only and for his sake alone can the soul have access to God, and there is no other name under heaven whereby prayer can have validity. The phrase "for Christ's sake" is necessary in all effectual prayer, and has a clear metaphysical authority. The beauty of prayer is further shown in its results, in the insight so gained into the life of both the conditioned and the Absolute. This knowledge is more extensive and reliable than any other. All physical science is neces-

sarily "through a glass, darkly." Mental sciences are more accurate in that the observer is "face to face" with his psychic specimens. But in both departments the knowledge has two limitations—the observer is fallible, and the mental and physical specimens are inadequate revelations of reality and are studied under necessarily defective conditions of experimentation. But, in prayer, that unique attitude of the particular to the Universal, there is only one limitation to knowledge—the worshiper. The revelations of the Absolute in prayer are more direct and extensive than in the ordinary mental life or in the cosmos, and, if made at all, are wholly sincere. The finite spirit, illumined by the shekinah of the unconditioned, sees painfully its own most secret faults; and he who prays in humble faith can thereby view the unveiled glory of reality, forever hidden from the intellectual scrutiny of him who studies but prays not. The action of the religious consciousness in prayer is the metaphysical acme of cognition. It yields to ontology and epistemology their most precious data.

III. The theological. The divine participation in prayer is more important than the human. A thorough understanding of prayer can be found, not in a description of its mental accompaniments, nor in an analysis of its basal principles, but only through theology, which—being the interpretation of the divine life as revealed in the facts of the religious consciousness of man in history, in the cosmos, and in Christ—is the most accurate, comprehensive, and important of all the sciences. Thoughtful minds may have difficulty in harmonizing prayer with the attributes of God. It seems to contradict his omniscience. Is not prayer, they suggest, absurd in relation to an omniscient spirit? If he knows us infinitely better than we do ourselves, is it not a farce, they ask, to tell him the sins we commit, the longings we have, the gladness we feel? Some prayers, doubtless many, do undertake this ridiculous task of tutoring God. But prayer should not attempt to add to that life in which there are no shadows of ignorance, no fluctuations of passion, no maelstroms of doubt. In act, word, and thought we do indeed express what is eternally known to him; but thus only can a relationship to him be established which is not intellectual but volitional. Prayer is a communion, not a recitation; companionship, not coercion; petition

with compliance or refusal, not question with answer or silence. Conditioned by faith, it presupposes our receptivity, obedience, and cooperation, recognizes God's perfections and sovereignty, and acknowledges in him the solution of all life's puzzles.

A greater difficulty is to reconcile prayer with God's omnipotence. His eternal purpose is to reveal himself through an orderly system of finite spirits, objects, and events. Does prayer disturb this revelation and alter the course of events? If this purpose should require a rainstorm, an earthquake, the ruin of a nation, the success of a battle, the death of a loved one, the salvation of one of our friends and the damnation of another, can our prayers prevent these occurrences? When President Garfield was shot, the Christian world agonized in prayer for his recovery; but he died. What good did all this praying do? Such queries may be answered by distinguishing the principles of the divine character from their revelation in objects and events. God is almighty. But he is not an almighty brute, or machine, or lunatic. He is an omnipotent person whose life, being regulated by reason, is one of infinite love. The principles of that life are unalterable. If all the Christians of all ages should unite in prayer to change a principle of the divine character, the petition would be unheeded. The eternal reason cannot be absurd. He cannot deny himself. But the revelation of reason in concrete events is not unalterable. The fact of prayer, and of its influence upon events, is presupposed in the system of finite spirits constituting the kingdom of God. Prayers are dynamic. They cannot change God's eternal purpose. But they do influence the manifestation of that purpose in the cosmos and in history. Hence the "accepted prayer" of faith commits itself to God in complete confidence that it will be disposed of in wise accord with his ultimate purpose.

But can prayer be reconciled with foreordination? If our friend's damnation is predetermined from all eternity, why commit the absurdity of praying for his salvation? We do so pray because such events are not foreordained. God is responsible for, and does foreordain certain elements in, all objects and events. The cosmos, the moral system, our own powers are predetermined. But the use of these powers, our sins and consequent damnation, we alone control. God's knowledge and power are not limited. His responsibility is. He is not responsible

for sin or for righteousness, but only for the freedom whose expression they are. And that this expression—either the unselfish choice of God as the supreme object of love, or the sinful choice of self as that object—is completely within our control is overwhelmingly proven by the testimony of consciousness. The remorse and penitence of the millions who have found peace only in prayer to a forgiving God; the lives of the martyrs, of Luther, Bunyan, and Jerry McAuley, are convincing proof that our destiny is in our own power. Consciousness, the soul's impartial tribunal, pronounces its sentence, not upon an innocent deity, but upon the deliberately criminal self.

Prayer is connected with the origin and continuance of the Christian life. It is potent in conversion and in Christian culture. Prayer "without ceasing" is the unbroken sequence of a Christian's acts and thoughts. Time and place are nonessentials. If business men prayed over their counters, farmers in their dairies, mechanics at the lathes, and cooks in the kitchen; if students in class rooms used swift, brief, silent prayers instead of sly peeps into text-books; if prayer were offered steadily and silently, not merely at church or at night and morning, but everywhere, on the streets, in stores, on railway trains, the world would be better. There would be more answers to prayer. One who prays thus secretly, not thrice but a hundred times a day—thirty-six thousand five hundred prayers a year, short ones—will be surprised to see the delicate touch of God in the details of life. And prayer is not merely language, or thought, or action. "Prayer" is ordinarily pronounced as a monosyllable, like "there," "where," "care." But the word is a dissyllable. The stem is "pray;" and the suffix *er*, like the Latin *or* in *orator*, and the Greek *ωρ* in *ῥήτωρ*, means actor or agent. A pray-er is one who prays. The Christian is himself a pray-er; and the Christian civilization which, despite its depreciation by skeptics and its competition with baser creeds, is enhancing every phase of life, is the modern world's sterling tribute to the Pray-er of pray-ers.

John Biggam.

## ART. III.—DID THE GAELIC CHURCH REVIVE PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATION?

HIGH Churchmen are apt to make poor historical scholars. Certain elements of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, nay, of the papacy, unquestionably occur in the New Testament. A High Churchman is one who, fastening on the elements of which his own system is the specific development, slights the others, and thereby makes out his own polity to be the exclusively legitimate and divine frame of the Church. Among Protestants the Episcopalians and American Congregationalists appear at present to be the most strenuously active in this reversal of history, this backward projection into the pregnant fullness of the apostolic age of the hard exclusiveness of later antagonisms. Among the latter, however, this folly is no longer perpetrated by scholars. Methodism, by its youth and its history, is not much exposed to this temptation. Presbyterianism itself, so far as we can judge, is at present not greatly inclined this way. What we once heard the illustrious Henry Boynton Smith declare from the pulpit is, we fancy, very widely applicable in his denomination: "We are Presbyterians, but not *jure divino* Presbyterians." All the more, when we do find a presbyterian High Churchman, we find one of the most thorough grain. Such a one is the eminent Dr. Killen, of the Assembly's College at Belfast. We hardly know which to admire the most, the bishop who informs us that the threefold ministry was universally accepted in the Church by the year 100, or the presbyter who informs us\* that it was first established at Rome, about 140, and from there spread elsewhere, and who interprets Cyprian's phrase, *Roma, unde sacerdotalis unitas exorta est*, as meaning this. That the individual episcopate at Rome first came to distinct development about 140 is highly probable; but that it spread from hence eastward, instead of being the westward term of a process of some seventy years, beginning where heresies first began, in Syria and Asia Minor, is as fine an instance of historical preposterousness, in the literal sense, as could easily be adduced.

Dr. Killen is equally heroic when he quotes Polycarp's modest

\* Killen, *The Old Catholic Church*, p. 53.

address, "Polycarp, and the elders with him," as proof that he was not then supposed to have been specifically bishop at Smyrna; and when he quotes the fact, apparent by the same letter, that Philippi was then governed simply by presbyters, as a proof that "the churches" were then presbyterially governed, as if there could be no bishops in Asia because there was as yet no bishop in Philippi. In this forming period of the Church, as Jean Réville emphasizes, there might easily have been twenty varieties of Church government in as many regions. Christians were not yet bound up into any uniformity of administration, nor had they yet discovered that we are not justified by Christ, but by Christ and church government.

However, we are not proposing to argue with Dr. Killen as to the date when the individual episcopate had become universal throughout the Catholic churches. All will allow that by the time of Cyprian, at the middle of the third century, no other polity is accepted as legitimate among the orthodox.

This, however, does not necessarily imply that presbyters might not as yet have been held capable of ordaining presbyters. Indeed, Dr. Killen gives overwhelming proof\* that in the second century the presbyters still set apart their own bishops. And aside from this the distinction between bishop and presbyter was at first only administrative. Both Jerome and Augustine declare it to be valid "because the custom of the Church has made it valid." There was not supposed to be any intrinsic necessity in the fact that the bishop alone commonly baptized and celebrated the eucharist, and there was no more any intrinsic reason why he alone should ordain. It sufficed all the purposes of episcopal government that the bishop should have all the sacred offices under his control. The actual functions of baptism and the communion he might delegate, and why not of ordination? That bishops did, in fact, more or less delegate to presbyters the right of ordaining presbyters seems plain from the fact that, as late as 314, the Council of Ancyra forbids *chorepiscopi* to ordain presbyters or deacons, but allows city presbyters to do so, if specifically commissioned by their bishop, who could keep a keener watch over his urban subordinates than over his rural colleagues.†

\* *The Ancient Church*, chap. ix.

† We have here no occasion to consider Anglican exceptions to this interpretation of the Council of Ancyra. We give the statement of the learned Anglicans, Smith and Cheetham.



Yet there was a growing tendency to confine to the bishop not merely the power of authorizing, but that of administering, ordination, at least ordination to the presbyterate. The inferior orders, from deacon down, were hardly vital. Even yet it is a moot point in the Roman Catholic Church whether the pope might not, if he would, authorize a presbyter to ordain a deacon (as indeed was once done in Cyprian's church), while all allow that he could not possibly authorize a presbyter to ordain a presbyter. Nor is it held by anyone that an invalid diaconate vitiates a subsequent presbyterate. When we speak of ordination, therefore, let it, unless otherwise required, be understood only of the ordination of presbyters. As the Church multiplied the bishop became increasingly incompetent to exercise the ministry alone, but remained perfectly competent to transmit it alone. And, as it became more and more necessary to station presbyters at a distance from the bishop, it became increasingly necessary to guard against their possible usurpation of episcopal authority. We see this from the action of Ancyra itself. The most obvious precaution, therefore, was at length absolutely to inhibit presbyters from ever ordaining presbyters. This appears to have become the Egyptian discipline before 350, for some time earlier we find an Egyptian council disallowing the standing of a claiming presbyter on the ground that he had not been ordained by a bishop. It should seem, therefore, that not long previously presbyterial ordination had been recognized, or else why should this man have resorted to it?

For the reasons given, the tendency to confine the power of ordaining absolutely to the bishops continually gathered strength. It seems well made out that originally the country bishops, the *chorepiscopi*, had full episcopal competency. Yet in the East the city bishops gradually deprived them of the right of ordaining presbyters and deacons. No wonder, then, that they finally withdrew this power from presbyters, who appear to have exercised it very rarely before. By the year 400 the incompetency of presbyters to ordain appears to be unconditional. Jerome, writing to the Roman pope, and exalting the presbyterate against the episcopate, which he rightly declares to have been distinguished from it rather by the Church than by Christ or the apostles, adds, "And even now, what can a bishop do which a presbyter cannot also do, except ordain?" The

argument would have been triumphant if he could have added, "And he can even ordain, if episcopally authorized." He does not add this, doubtless because he could not, because presbyters by that time were absolutely inhibited from ordaining.

Yet Dr. Killen maintains that presbyterial ordination, thus by 400 absolutely extinct in the Catholic Church at large, survived, or was revived in the monasteries, and was exercised for centuries by the abbots within the Latin Church, and that it was an unquestioned competency of the abbots in the Gaelic Church, though he allows that it was very commonly exercised, even in this, by bishops.

It is hard to prove a negative. We cannot undertake to show that from 400 to 800, or later, some abbots of the Latin Church may not have ordained some monks presbyters, and shuffled them in among the authentic clergy. We only adduce some general considerations adverse to this assumption, and then examine Dr. Killen's positive proofs in favor of it. We will afterward take up the Gaelic Church. The question whether presbyterianism existed far into the Middle Ages is certainly an interesting and curious one.

We have seen that by the year 400 presbyterial ordination was extinct throughout the Græco-Latin Church. Dr. Killen also gives this date. The power of the bishops was growing daily, and the rights of the presbyters were daily declining. The bishops were jealously vigilant against all attempts to renew obscure and half-forgotten prerogatives of the second order, as they were steadily curtailing the rights of the humbler members of their own. Can anything be imagined more likely to provoke them against the rising monasticism (of which we know them to have been in fact the zealous patrons) than the knowledge that the abbots pretended to the right of ordaining presbyters, even had the abbots been presbyters themselves? But they were not. Most of the abbots were simple laymen, say Smith and Cheetham, till into the seventh century, and lay abbots are found till into the eleventh.\* They were therefore wholly incompetent, on any theory, to ordain. Yet, in his *History of the Old Catholic Church*, Dr. Killen takes no account of this vital fact. He shows that he knows it, as of course he does, by saying that the abbot Entyches, the heresiarch, "was

\* These were real abbots, not, like later lay abbots, mere commendataries.

also a presbyter," which implies that abbots generally were not presbyters, just as, when we say that the Benedictine abbot of West Australia "is also a bishop," this implies that abbots are not usually bishops. Now, the three or four early monastic rules which Dr. Killen supposes to make for him provide for the rights of abbots generically, not merely of abbots who are presbyters. But a layman, abbot or not, is not capable, nor is it to be supposed that he has ever been capable, of ordaining so much as a doorkeeper. The nonsacramental minor orders may in modern times be given by an abbot, but only if he is himself a priest. The *potestas ordinandi*, therefore, ascribed in these rules to the abbot, without regard to order, is assuredly not "the power of ordaining." It is simply the power of admitting to the monachate, as the episcopal *potestas ordinandi* is the right of admitting to the priesthood.

However, before going further into this point, let us dispose of a much earlier instance, in which Dr. Killen sees, and we are inclined to think warrantably, a case of presbyterial ordination. He quotes Cassian, who says that Paphnutius, a presbyter and abbot—not the noted Nicene bishop—advanced a young brother Daniel to the diaconate, and then to the presbyterate. As this was hardly twenty-five years later than the Council of Ancyra, in Asia Minor, which had expressly permitted episcopally authorized presbyters to ordain presbyters, it looks as if Paphnutius may himself have ordained Daniel. Yet this is doubtful, for this was in Egypt, where the orthodox Paphnutius might well have hesitated to contravene the express decision of the great Athanasius against presbyterial ordination. The term *provexit* is not decisive. If Paphnutius procured Daniel to be ordained by some bishop to whom the sanctity of the abbot was a command, *provexit* would be perfectly in place. Abbots of to-day are continually "advancing" their monks to the priesthood, not by ordaining them—to which they are incompetent—but by procuring their ordination. This therefore may have been a last lingering exercise of presbyterial ordination, or it may not.

To return to the monastic rules. We are all given to astonishing oversights, and since the time of George Primrose and his journey to Amsterdam to teach the Dutch English without once remembering that he did not know Dutch, we

have noticed none more astonishing than Dr. Killen's entire oblivion of the fact—the hinge of the whole discussion—that *ordinare* and “ordain” are as far as possible from being equivalent terms. *Ordinare* goes beyond on every side. We have *ordinare presbyterum*, to ordain a priest; *ordinare monachum*, to profess a monk; *ordinare consulem*, to appoint a consul; *ordinare monasterium*, to regulate a monastery; *ordinare regem*, to consecrate a king; and so on indefinitely. To “ordain,” as a function of the Latin Church, means exclusively to admit to the eight hierarchical grades of doorkeeper, reader, exorcist, acolyte, subdeacon, deacon, presbyter, bishop. *Ordinare* means to admit to any office, grade, status, whatever, in Church or State; to regulate affairs or institutions; and we know not what besides. Ordaining clergymen and enacting ordinances are the two points of meeting, but all the wide sweep beyond belongs only to *ordinare*. Indeed, so far is the earlier Church Latin from jealous rigor of use, that the still higher term *consecrare* is once used by Innocent III of the mere translation of an already consecrated bishop. *Ordinatio* is also the name of a part of the papal inauguration service, although, as the pope is almost always a bishop already, he is usually no longer capable of being “ordained.” Yet he is still capable, it seems, of receiving an *ordinatio*. So it would be perfectly good Latin to speak of the *ordinatio cardinalium*, although a man is neither ordained nor consecrated cardinal.

Therefore the *potestas ordinandi* of the rules is not the “power of ordaining.” It is the “power of admitting.” Admitting to what depends on the connection. Ordination is an ecclesiastical act, and the early abbot was not an ecclesiastical functionary. He was not usually in any grade of the ministry. Gregory the Great sets the monastic and the ecclesiastical life sharply in antithesis. “An abbot,” says he, “ought not to exercise any grade of the clericate.” Yet Dr. Killen supposes him to have exercised even the specific function of the episcopate. Benedict, Gregory's great master, had been a simple layman, and that is the monastic ideal which Gregory upholds. He will have the abbot the obedient subject of his bishop. The ordinations in the monastery, of every grade, he ascribes to the bishop; yet he is equally resolute in defending the properly monastic authority of the abbot. We know how much occa-

sion there was for this during centuries. The bishops, almost inevitably, but often very provokingly, would insist on confounding their own general right of ecclesiastical supervision with the abbot's right of interior monastic government. This Gregory forbids. "Let not the bishop," says he, "administer even the most inconsiderable ordination—*levissimam ordinationem*—within the monastery, save by the abbot's request." These are the ordinations of the monks to the various grades of the hierarchy, which, though strongly discouraged, could not be altogether forbidden. The *ordinatio monachorum*, the admission, or as now called, "the profession," of monks, was an entirely different thing. It is not an ecclesiastical, a hierarchical, but a monastic act. Therefore it properly appertained to the abbot, whether he were a priest or a layman. Yet the bishops, it appears, often arrogated it to themselves. Against this abuse various rules, sanctioned, it appears, by great bishops or by councils, make provision. Aurelian, a bishop of Gaul, who is quoted by Dr. Killen, draws up a rule for the abbots subject to him, and perhaps in commission of a council, by which it appears that he was himself accustomed to admit their monks. Indeed, as he was an abbot as well as a bishop, this was the more natural. Yet he allows that this right exists in their monasteries only by their good will, for he says: "*Et quando (abbas) voluerit ordinandi habeat potestatem.*" Assuredly Aurelian is not intending to part with the prerogative which St. Jerome a hundred and fifty years earlier had regretfully admitted to have already become the incommunicable jewel of the episcopate. He is not trying, at the risk of deposition, to convey to his abbots, or those of his neighbor bishops, an attribute which the Catholic Church would have voided in the use. What possible motive could he have had for this heretical superserviceableness? He is simply assuring his abbots that although he commonly exercises not only the *potestas ordinandi ad ordines*, which is inherent in his episcopal office, but also, even in their convents, the *potestas ordinandi ad monachatum*, which was inherent in theirs, he does the latter only by their good will. It never seems to enter Dr. Killen's head that *ordinatio monachorum* and *ordinatio monachorum in presbyteros* are two fundamentally different things. There is an ecclesiastical *potestas ordinandi*. This appertains to the

bishops. There is a monastic *potestas ordinandi*. This appertains to the abbots. A rule for bishops, giving them this power of admission, would mean the ecclesiastical power. A rule for abbots, giving it to them, means the monastic power. How far these two powers are delegable, or interchangeable, rests on entirely independent data. Aurelian assures to all his abbots, whether presbyters or laymen, his colleagues as abbots, the equal monastic *potestas ordinandi*.

Certainly the wildest theological theorist of that day—had there been any—would never have dreamed of claiming for laymen, of whatever monastic standing, the power of ordaining priests. Yet this is what Dr. Killen's interpretation involves. Moreover, he supposes that Aurelian, in contradiction to Catholic doctrine and practice, is making over to his abbots an indeterminate power of obtruding upon him a swarm of new priests for whose clerical conduct he alone is responsible. For the official worthiness of every priest, whether monk or secular, the bishop himself was then accountable. It seems to us, at least, that a more astonished bishop would be hard to imagine than Aurelian would have been, could he have been told that he was supposed to be giving away his episcopal right of admitting presbyters simply because he assures to the abbots their monastic power of admitting monks. This right, *ordinandi monachos*—now commonly called "professing" monks—abbots and other superiors enjoy to this day, while abbesses must resort to a bishop. A monastic rule giving to the abbot *potestas ordinandi monachos suos in presbyteros* Dr. Killen does not cite, and probably will never find one to cite. When, as occasionally happens, an abbot is also a bishop, he has this power by virtue of his episcopate, but of that only.

On one page the author quotes an old English rule, of perhaps A. D. 630, saying that an abbot "*non potest aliquem ordinare de suis propinquis, neque de alienis, nec alio abbati dare si non voluerint fratres,*" as a proof that in England also abbots originally had the power of ordaining. So they had, as they still have, everywhere. But it is the monastic, not the sacramental, power. It admits, not to the priesthood, but to the monastery. In modern English, as we have said, it is commonly called "professing a monk." The abbot is here forbidden to burden the monastery with new monks unless the



brethren consent, and subordinately and subsequently is forbidden to transfer an already accepted monk without their consent. Whether a monk already an inmate should be admitted a priest or not was a matter of inferior import. The abbot is not forbidden to ordain a monk a priest, for the very sufficient reason that he could not. He is not required to consult the brethren as to the ordination of such a monk by the bishop, for it would add no new burdens, nor make any essential change. A monastic priest would wear the same garb and follow the same rule as a lay monk. Not till sometime between 1000 and 1200 did the possession of holy orders distinguish between governing and serving brethren.

The ordination of abbots themselves requires few words. Gregory the Great refers it to bishops. Some other rules commit it to abbots, apparently only when presbyters, or to other priests. Gregory's rule has prevailed, but not universally. Sometimes abbots consecrate abbots. It is of no special importance. An abbot's consecration, it is true, is often a great solemnity. If of the higher rank, he is consecrated almost like a bishop. He receives imposition of hands, though not the chrism; is invested with buskins and gloves, with the pectoral cross, the miter and crozier, and proceeds through the church blessing the people, exactly like a new-made bishop. Yet to all this stately ceremony is attributed not one least vanishing touch of sacramental virtue. Its efficacy is purely *ex opere operantium*, not at all *ex opere operato*. It exalts the rank of the new prelate, but leaves him in point of order and of sacramental capacity precisely where he was before. Indeed, so little necessary is it that there are various abbots who, when once chosen, are, without any ceremony, *ipso facto* consecrate.

Now comes the question, Did the Gaelic Church, after her foundation under Patrick in the fifth century, or after her extension into Caledonia under Columba in the last of the sixth, revive presbyterial ordination? The Gaelic Church, existing in Ireland and Scotland, was the daughter, not of the Roman Church specifically, but nevertheless of the Latin Church. Succath (St. Patrick), whether born at Dumbarton, or, as Dr. Killen holds, we think with reason, to be more probable, in northwestern Gaul, was a Roman citizen. His father was a decurio, or Roman functionary of some rank. His name, or



rather title, of Patricius, "nobleman," expresses this. His father was a deacon, his grandfather a presbyter, of the Latin Church. The Celtic Bretons were not very exact in conformity, but they were both in doctrine and polity orthodox Roman Christians. Even Dr. Killen allows that Patrick, son of a deacon, grandson of a priest, himself obtained episcopal consecration to give him full competency for his mission. Here we have the three fundamental orders of the Catholic Church. From his time we have an uninterrupted succession of bishops in Ireland. Indeed, there was small likelihood of interruption, for the little island, not larger than South Carolina, had three hundred bishops at the least account, and each seems to have exercised his right of transmitting all the orders nearly at his absolute discretion, although in a vague subordination to Armagh.

This brings in the question, Was the Gaelic Church episcopal or not? In one sense it was, in another it was not. It was episcopal assuredly in having an almost unbounded affluence of bishops that enjoyed an uninterrupted succession—not in particular sees, but as a body—through a great bishop and missionary, from the Latin episcopate.\* It was nonepiscopal in the sense that, had it begun without the specific episcopate, there was nothing in Gaelic society that would have suggested the necessity of establishing this episcopacy among the Gael, which, though never interrupted and always exercising its specific function of ordaining, really existed in large measure by traditional habit and by fraternal accommodation to the Church at large. As the Scottish historian, Dr. Burton, well says, the interviews between Gaelic abbots and distinguished bishops resemble the reception of a king by a republican magistrate. The magistrate honors the august rank of his visitor, but as something extrinsic to his own system. The episcopate was really an outgrowth of the urban life of the Græco-Roman world. Though it spread into the country parts it could not maintain itself there. To this day, with very few exceptions, every Catholic bishop has a civic title, even if it be of a city now vanished. For ages, in the Latin countries, the bishops had no authority outside the precinct of their own cities. But among the Gael the city did not exist, or was a wretched aggregation

\* Of course, we are not talking about an unbroken inward validity. As Cardinal Newman says, this can only be believed on the faith of a miracle.

of cabins that signified nothing. The organizing unit of society was the clan, or perhaps rather its subdivision the sept, easily detaching itself into a new clan. The Irish Church was the most intensely ascetic and monastic Church that has ever existed. The severity of the Irish discipline was extreme. Each monastery, with its surrounding colony, became a new sept or clan, of which the abbot was chief. He was sometimes a bishop, sometimes a presbyter, sometimes a married layman, supervising the monks but not properly himself a monk, sometimes a lay monk. On the other hand, the nonmonastic bishops had no strictly defined jurisdiction, and were not much revered. They, therefore, had no power to compete in importance with the abbots, who, especially in Caledonia, seem to have acted very much as their metropolitans. They largely sank into simple agents of ordination.

This metropolitan rank belonged above all to the presbyter abbot of Iona. From this great foundation almost all Celtic Scotland had been evangelized. As the great mother-house of Benedictinism, Monte Cassino, signified much more in the Church than a good many common bishoprics, although its abbots never acted as bishops, so by incomparably stronger titles the abbey of Iona did not merely influence, but actually governed, the whole Caledonian Church, bishops, presbyters, and people. This Bede explicitly sets forth, declaring that the bishops of the mainland were subject to the presbyter abbot of the island.

Now, the question is not, Did the Gaelic Church revive presbyterial government? In a profoundly modified form she did. Yet her form of government was much farther from primitive use than that of the Latin Church. In every episcopal town of the Continent the bishop and his chapter are still, however deeply modified, the lineal representatives of the original moderator and college of presbyters. In Celtic Scotland the metropolitan supremacy of a great monastery and its abbot corresponded to nothing whatever primitive. It was legitimate, doubtless, for it sprung from the soil and long did good work, but anything less scriptural in form or lineage could not be found. It revived presbyterial government, but only partially and casually. The Gaelic abbot, like the Latin, might be indifferently bishop, priest, or layman. In

Iona, it is true, he must be a priest. As a subordinate bishop could always be found to ordain, most abbots seem not to have cared to take a degree which had no other vital significance in their Church. It was not presbyterianism, but monasticism *versus* episcopacy. It was a very peculiar form of the great mediæval struggle between the dioceses and the monasteries.

Dr. Killen does not deny that the distinction of bishops and presbyters prevailed in the Gaelic Church from the beginning to the end of her independent history. It is true, in his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* he shuffles and equivocates in every possible way to make us forget this. He is fond of calling the bishops—who had each, from their numbers, a very limited range—parish ministers. Yet their districts were not smaller than various Italian dioceses now, although here and there there were curious aggregations of them. And he owns that the bishop was commonly served by eight or nine presbyters—a very decent staff for a small see. Many undoubted Latin bishops had only two or three presbyters. Some had not even one. The two indispensable ministers of a small Latin see were a bishop and a deacon. Presbyters were added as required. On this showing the Irish bishops were very comfortably provided with subordinate clergy.

Even so the author, when describing the final reduction of Ireland, about 1150, to some thirty dioceses, represents the bishops as country pastors, long accustomed to “presbyterian parity,” who were not likely to relish diocesan subjection. Yet he has told us that these “country pastors” had each of them eight or nine subordinate presbyters. By his own showing, therefore, there had never been “presbyterian parity,” but a multitudinous episcopal parity, served by a much more multitudinous presbyterial subordination.

Dr. Killen lays stress on the want of all signs of episcopal influence in early Ireland. True, where austere monasticism was the ideal, and where abbeys were numerous, at once rigorous and learned, these petty prelates and their subordinate presbyters amounted to little except to celebrate the rites of religion. But they were none the less bishops and presbyters. The distinction between these two orders did not lie in an eminent difference of rank or power, although, according to our author, both distinctions were found in Ireland. It lay

essentially, through all the ages of Irish as equally of Græco-Latin history after 400, in the fact that the bishop alone, as Jerome says, had the power to ordain. This distinction of degree and function was received from Patrick; it prevailed throughout Christendom; and the Irish, who were eminently and, as in the Easter question, sometimes unreasonably tenacious of ancient use, could have no possible reason for departing from it, especially as it was still connected with vague rights of superintendency. Nevertheless, Dr. Killen affirms that both in Ireland and in Gaelic Scotland the abbots always possessed, and not unfrequently exercised, the right of ordaining presbyters, and even bishops. Above all, he ascribes this prerogative to the abbot and monks of Iona.

Now, setting aside Iona for the present, what evidence does he produce? We may remark that he plays fast and loose here, as he does regarding the country bishops and presbyters. It is this which makes his works significant, for it shows the intrinsic weakness of this widely spread contention. In his Irish history he repeatedly speaks of "the bishops or abbots" in connections plainly showing his claim that the two terms had the same force. Indeed, he expressly cites a letter of Archbishop Laurentius, of Canterbury, addressed to "our eminent and dear brethren—*dominis caris fratribus*—the bishops or abbots throughout Scotia"—that is, Ireland and Gaelic Scotland—as proof that the Roman Catholic bishops regarded the two terms as virtually equivalent among the Gael. Yet, according to his own showing, the vast bulk of the Irish bishops were not abbots, but country pastors. Moreover, he expressly contrasts the presbyter abbot of Iona with his subordinate bishops. Moreover, he expressly mentions the courage of the young Columba in that, being only a presbyter, although already the abbot of several monasteries, he had the boldness to bring a leading bishop to terms. Yet, according to Dr. Killen, this same man, at this same time—before there was an Iona—was more than a bishop! Furthermore, he describes him as entitled to peculiar deference as a presbyter abbot, showing him to know that in Ireland, as on the Continent, most of the abbots were still laymen, and therefore incapable of ordaining to even the humblest Church office. Nevertheless, every abbot had been ordained a monk, and then an abbot. Yet, as Dr. Killen shows himself to be aware, these two *ordinationes*,

being of only monastic, not ecclesiastical, value, left the abbot still a layman, so that a presbyter abbot ranked much higher. Yet we are told that Laurentius, Justus, and Mellitus, three Roman bishops settled in England, conceived these lay abbots—for the letter makes no distinction—to be the same as bishops. They did, indeed, address their letter indifferently to bishops or abbots, not because abbot and bishop meant the same thing, but because either one or the other meant an influential dignitary. The letter, as quoted by Dr. Killen himself, and as given by Bede, expressly distinguishes Dagan, the Irish bishop, from Columban, the Irish abbot. Again, the author tells us that St. Malachy, on the edge of transition, but still under the old model, became a priest, then an abbot, then a bishop. He was plainly unaware that an abbot was *ipso facto* a bishop, nay, if a presbyter, more than a bishop.

The fact is, that between Dr. Killen's solicitude to make out the Gaelic abbots to be *ipso facto* bishops, and the stubborn, contradictory facts that fly in his face at every turn, he does not half the time seem to know what he is saying when on this topic. Everywhere else he is perfectly clear and strong, even when, as in talking about the Roman Catholic division of the Decalogue, he is grossly ignorant and calumnious. Dr. Killen declares that the Irish bishop sometimes received investiture, which he makes equivalent to ordination—but which, since the early ages, has been a very different thing—in the monastery to which he belonged, and sometimes was ordained by a neighboring bishop. Of this alternative he gives no proof. If the abbot had the intrinsic power of ordaining a bishop, why should he have summoned a bishop to ordain, or sent his monk to a bishop? He was not, like the pope now, too great a dignitary even to consecrate a bishop, except occasionally. The story told about Columba may be unauthentic—though Dr. Killen's criticism of it seems trivial, and even unmeaning—but it illustrates the usage of the Gaelic Church. His own abbot, St. Finnian, was only a presbyter, but desired to have a bishop in his monastery. He therefore sent him to Etchen, the resident bishop of another abbey, for consecration. He found Etchen plowing, and in the hurry—this was before the days of spectacles—St. Finnian's message was misread, and instead of bishop the young man was ordained priest. This story, true

or false, is redolent of the elder Gaelic times. Everything in it is simple and primitive. It sees nothing amiss in a presbyter abbot using the episcopal services of a subordinate bishop. Dr. Killen is very scornful over such "puppets," but his contempt of them does not annihilate them. He cannot deny that for several centuries such monastic bishops existed throughout the Church. Professor G. T. Stokes \* shows that they were found from Ireland to Mount Sinai. Dr. Killen has a great spite at them, but all the comfort we can give him is that though they assuredly once lived they are all dead now. They have modern successors, more or less, but somewhat differently circumstanced.

Dr. Killen is so determined to make out early Irish abbots *ipso facto* bishops that he will even have them to have carried their episcopate with them into the Latin Church, where no such strange discipline has ever prevailed. Even those rules which the author distorts out of their meaning, as we have seen, by his mistranslations of *ordinare*, give the abbot only a monastic authority. He will have it that Virgil, or Ferghal, was, about 750, an ordained abbot in Ireland—although the high authority of Dr. Lanigan disputes the identity, and although Virgil's contemporaries and later biographers know nothing of it—and that, going to Germany, and becoming abbot of St. Peter's, at Salzburg, he for two years "dissembled his ordination," and put forward an Irish bishop, Dobda, to perform episcopal acts. Now, first, this statement comes from a source four hundred years later, a cleric of Salzburg. Second, this cleric knows nothing of Virgil as either abbot or monk, either at Salzburg or at home. The abbey of St. Peter's contained the episcopal chair, and Virgil, who was bishop designate, appointed by the Duke of Bavaria, may have been, like many bishops—notably Canterbury—*ex officio* abbot of the monastic chapter. His successor in the see speaks of "Virgil, abbot of St. Peter's." The elder authorities say nothing of his having been himself a monk. His biographer is not describing his government of an abbey, but of a great bishopric, although Dobda probably had his home in the monastery, for he bears the specific title *pro-prius episcopus*. *Ordinatio* may mean indifferently "ordination, benediction as abbot, designation, episcopal consecration."

\* *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, p. 105.



The writer of 1180 cannot, possibly, by the *dissimulata ordinatio* mean "benediction," for whatever Dr. Killen, by dint of mistranslation, may endeavor to make out for the earlier centuries, it is certain that to a Roman Catholic clergyman of 1180 such a thing was inconceivable as that a mere abbot could ordain. It cannot mean "episcopal consecration," for the biographer expressly says that only after two years was Virgil persuaded "to receive the episcopal unction" at the hands of his comprovincial bishops, and "was ordained," that is, to the episcopate. It may mean his designation, for this came from the duke—prompted by the king—and he may easily have concealed it from the people, as if he had a mere temporary commission, until after two years he made up his mind to remain, and then at length receiving consecration, no longer needed the episcopal offices of Bishop Dobda, whom he established in a subordinate see. This gives a perfectly good sense, and is accepted by the learned Franciscan Pagi. Lastly, it may mean "sacerdotal ordination." If supposed a layman, he could still govern a bishopric, but could evidently slip out of it more easily than if known as a priest. It agrees with this that, if he really is the Virgil who quarreled with Boniface over Antipodes—which, as Pagi remarks, is far from certain—Boniface did not know him to be a priest, or else the archbishop must have been curiously negligent in his report to the pope; for Zachary says, "We do not know whether he has the style of presbyter." Dr. Killen says that, if he had been supposed a layman, he could not have acted as abbot. He could have acted perfectly well, then and for the two hundred and fifty years ensuing. He could do something much more, he could govern a bishopric. Laymen have often governed far greater bishoprics, sometimes for years together, only, like this supposed layman, using auxiliar bishops for necessary offices. Dr. Killen's argument, therefore, breaks down at every point. Whatever Virgil's biographer may mean by "*dissimulata ordinatio*," there is one thing which he cannot mean. He cannot mean ordination as abbot, for, first, abbatial ordination gave no such rights in the Latin Church; and, secondly, the biographer does not know that Virgil was an abbot, or a monk at all. So much for Dr. Killen's attempt to extend over Germany from Ireland monastic rights not existing at home.

Dr. Killen's strong card, however, is Iona. He is greatly helped, moreover, by a confirmed habit of his. In his *Old Catholic Church*, *Ancient Church*, and *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* alike, he is completely ruled by an unrelenting—we had almost said an unblushing—High Church Presbyterianism. Whatever facts interfere with this must reckon with a flood of suppositions and *a priori* assumptions that could dissolve anything or create anything. This is what makes his works so valuable as a type of a habit of mind still perniciously strong in the Church. Thus he tells us that Columba, in Ireland, being only a presbyter, was admired for his courage in resisting a bishop. Yet when he goes over to Scotland, Columba suddenly discovers himself to be more than a bishop, and begins to ordain and send out bishops. In other words, he becomes a revolutionary reformer, remaining wholly unconscious of the fact, while his brethren in Ireland remain wholly unconscious of it too. Moreover, he effects a revolution in polity in an age not at all troubled about polity, but quietly resting on traditional use. The very conflicts which ensued between the Roman Catholic and the Irish clergy rest on this quiet and firm adherence to tradition. Of a radical revolt against the settled doctrine and use of the Church as to the ministry, and of a reversion to a supposed New Testament model, as with the Presbyterians and Independents at the Reformation, there is not a trace among the Irish. The Romans never accuse them of it. The long separation of the two parties by a wall of intruding heathenism had developed a wide divergence of use and of important points of polity, leaving, however, the common basis—the threefold ministry—intact. The Romans, from their coming to England, in 597, down to the Irish Synod of Kells, in 1152, never impeach the Gaelic ordinations of invalidity,\* but only of irregularity. They allege (1) that the Gael, in ordaining a bishop, only call in one bishop instead of three; (2) that they had no metropolitans to give their bishops due investiture. A third charge, which would in Roman Catholic eyes have absolutely annulled the Irish ordinations—namely, that they ordained bishops by presbyters—the Roman Catholics never bring. A solitary reordination of a Gaelic bishop by

\* It would be more accurate to say that they sometimes insisted on a *confirmatio ordinum*, which may sometimes verge on reordination, but, as Professor Bright shows, seems rather to denote the rectification of an irregular but valid ordination.

a Romanizing bishop is found—that of Chad by Theodore. This is the more remarkable inasmuch as, all through the Middle Ages, invalidity and irregularity were perpetually confounded, the Augustinian doctrine that even a schismatic ordination, otherwise sufficient, holds good, not having been definitely established until after the great schism. We might therefore expect to find numerous reordinations of conforming Irish; yet we find, it would seem, only this one.\* At the final submission of Ireland to Rome such a thing is not suggested. Even the English Synod of Celeyth, in 816, which shuts Irish priests utterly out of English churches, does not allege the invalidity, but the extreme uncertainty, and also the uncanonical irregularity of the ordinations of these wandering Levites, which ought not to be encouraged in England. Bishop Gilbert also, in 1105, having been consecrated by Archbishop Anselm, of Canterbury, addressing his countrymen, does not reproach them with invalid, but only with schismatical, customs. Even on the Continent,† where some regulations direct the Irish priests to be reordained, they are expressly designated as having been already ordained “by the bishops of the Scots.” Nothing is said of any ordination by presbyters. Nay, the direction is extended to those ordained “by the bishops of the Britons,” that is, of the Welsh. The common ground alleged is, for both nations, the uncertainty of the credentials produced by their wandering clergy, their irregular customs, but especially their schismatic Easter observance, which assuredly had nothing to do with their ordination. The annulment of their ordinations is simply a truculent expression of contempt for an utterly unassimilable class of irresponsible wanderers. Since then there have been ordinations annulled on far less tenable grounds, and still more inconsistently with St. Augustine’s doctrine of order, to which Rome, since Constance, has reverted in theory although not always in practice. In the Britons, however, we find only one instance of such annulment,‡ and that apparently hesitating and provisional.

The evidence of Bede is of inestimable value. This great and good man, a North Englishman, never left the region in which the monks of Iona had labored. Living in the eighth

\* That is, of a bishop.

† This rule, we find, was English, not continental. (See the explanation under note on the preceding page.)

‡ That is, of an episcopal ordination.

century, he was perfectly familiar—by fresh tradition, by wide converse, and by abundant reading—with the customs of Iona, which were still in full vigor in Scotland, although in his time repelled from England. A loving Christian, he was none the less a firmly orthodox and obedient Roman Catholic monk. The most learned man of his age, he knew perfectly well that, whatever shadowy rights presbyters may have had in the beginning, the whole Catholic Church, Eastern and Western, had for at least four hundred and fifty years declared heretical and void all attempts of theirs to ordain, even to their own order, but above all to the episcopate. Familiar with every application of Church Latin, he was of course incapable of falling into any of Dr. Killen's whimsical blunders over *ordinare*. Writing as a Roman Catholic priest for learned Roman Catholics, it doubtless never once occurred to him that when he spoke of the *ordinatio* of a Scottish bishop by a presbyter abbot anybody could suppose that these thoroughly orthodox, though highly irregular, brethren assumed for a moment, being only presbyters, to have the sacramental power of conveying even the presbyteral character, which the supreme jurisdiction of the Catholic Church had, before the very foundation of Gaelic Christianity, definitely withdrawn from their order. Still less could he suppose it possible that he could be taken to mean that these orthodox presbyters—as good Catholics as he, though of a widely different observance—imagined themselves to have the sacramental power, by the imposition of their own hands, of conveying the still higher episcopal character. He gently laments over their uncanonical, never over their invalid, ordinations. The constant accusation of the Romans against the Irish is that in ordaining a bishop they only summon one bishop. That they ever ordained a bishop without any bishop is never alleged. Bede's mind is not fixed on the self-understood imposition of episcopal hands in raising the saintly Aidan to the episcopal degree. It is fixed on the more important *ordinatio*—the solemn designation by which Aidan was sent forth by his abbot and his brethren as a missionary bishop to heathen England. Troubled as Bede is by the canonical irregularity of this monastic act of metropolitan authority, he recognizes its supreme Christian importance, and nowhere breathes a doubt of its validity. A Roman pope once

calls a much less important investiture even *consecratio*. Bede has not troubled himself to remember the name of the bishop who, under monastic direction, celebrated the consecration; for though his office was most honorable the mission did not proceed from him. Bishop Reeves remarks here that the jurisdiction for Aidan's ordination came from the Abbot Segienus, but that the essential function, the conveyance to Aidan of the episcopal character, must have been ministered through the hands of a bishop. To this Dr. Killen scornfully replies that it should seem then that "the essential function" of episcopal ordination was of very slight account—hardly worth the keeping. As he pleases. These good monks would have thought so too had they been Irish Presbyterians. But though gloriously Irish, it so happens that they were not Presbyterians, nor even Protestants. They were Gaelic Catholics, differing widely in observance, but not at all in doctrine or in fundamental use, from Roman Catholics. That which the unswerving tradition of the Church had for many generations declared essential to a valid ministry they, long so unswervingly faithful to an Easter tradition confessedly not fundamental and demonstrably incorrect, were not likely to reject as a superfluity.

The author next declares the functions of such an ordaining bishop, acting under direction, rather pitiable. Is, then, the discharge of a sacred and august function, under a higher authority, so very pitiable? Would a bishop summoned to consecrate such a man as Aidan have been likely to feel very much humiliated by the summons? Dr. Killen talks as if these subordinate bishops had been mere animated implements, allowed no exercise of their own judgment or conscience when summoned to ordain. There is not the slightest reason to believe this. Dr. Killen quotes, and does not repel, the comparison of these subordinate bishops to the Moravian bishops. It should seem, then, that he regards the position of these latter as "pitiable."\* Protestant Christendom thinks very differently. It would indeed be pitiable if they were obliged to ordain every one presented to them, however well assured of his unworthiness. But the very thought is an insult to the *unitas fratrum*. And it is an equal insult to the godly monks of Iona to suppose

\* *Old Catholic Church*, p. 294, compared with *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. I, p. 104.

that they could not have bishops liable to a call for ordaining services without forbidding them the exercise of their manhood and conscience. Had that been the spirit of Iona she would hardly have evangelized northern and middle England. Even the Jesuit rule, however it may be applied in practice, expressly reserves to every brother the right to refuse to sin. In brief, neither Bede nor his Roman Catholic readers, believing as they did that Aidan and Finan were true bishops, can have supposed anything but that the ordaining monks called in the ministrations of a bishop.

Certain it is that bishops more or less subject in their functions to superiors have existed in the Church ever since Augustine was consecrated bishop at Hippo as helper to Valerius, and that the number has gone on increasing until it is now greater than ever. At present more than one fourth of the Roman Catholic episcopate is made up of titular bishops, who, except when vicars apostolic, can only act episcopally at the request of friends or at the direction of superiors, which last are often simple presbyters. Yet these titular bishops are not regarded, either by themselves or by other Catholics, as either "puppets" or "scullions," which last vulgarly abusive epithet, however, is not Dr. Killen's. He does not use such phrases. Bishop Hurst quotes it, with the just remark that it may be vituperation but is not argument. There is no argument in it. These titular bishops are revered as holding an august and sacred function, though, of course, unequal in rank to that of actual diocesans. Nor, being far from unfamiliar with Roman Catholicism, have we any reason to believe that a vicar-general, or vicar-capitular, or administrator, being only a presbyter, is accustomed to view an auxiliary bishop as a mere animated implement, not warranted to make any use, if required to ordain, of a possible better knowledge of his own. The very superiority of his degree, notwithstanding inferiority of jurisdiction, can never have failed of its effect on a member of the second order.

As to the case of Aidus and Findchan, which our author cites to prove that a Hebridean abbot could ordain, it proves that he could not. The bishop summoned, believing the prince and monk, Aidus, to be grossly unworthy, refused to ordain him, unless the abbot, Findchan, a man worse than the prince,



would first put his right hand on the head of the candidate, *pro confirmatione*. Notwithstanding this express distinction of the imposition of hands *pro confirmatione* from one *ad ordinationem*, Dr. Killen will have it that the abbot thereby ordained the young villain. Yet he says that thereupon the bishop "completed the ceremony." In other words, the bishop declared he would not ordain Aidus a priest unless the abbot ordained him first! The author thus represents the bishop as having merely consented to perform some supplementary ceremonies over the already ordained presbyter. If Dr. Killen will not admit this his interpretation is unintelligible. We would inform the author—what he does not appear to know—that to this day no bishop can ordain a monk a priest without the previous authorization of his superior. Whether this is given in writing, orally, or by significant gesture, is merely a matter of present use. In a worse than doubtful case like this the bishop might well require all three. The significant gesture, expressly declared to be *pro confirmatione*, must, of course, precede the ordination. That Columba's indignation descended chiefly on the head of the scandalous abbot is of course. It would be so to-day in any Roman Catholic abbey in a similar case. A vigilant pope would deal with the abbot, not the bishop. And if, as might easily be by ancient use, the abbot's *confirmatio* had consisted in an antecedent imposition of hands, a thundering rebuke of this act would certainly never be taken as confusing it with the entirely different meaning of the subsequent episcopal act.\*

Dr. Killen's supreme and concluding argument, however, is yet to come. In his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* he writes as follows: "In A. D. 574 he, Columbkille,† performed a ceremony which the Churches of Rome and England have always reserved for their highest functionaries. He ordained Aidan king of the Scottish Dalriada. The minister who ventured to ordain a king would not, surely, have scrupled to ordain a deacon or a bishop." Now, what are we to think of the ingenuousness of this? The author knows that in English ears "or-

\* Dr. Killen shows that, during the Irish penal laws, the bishop and his priests used to impose their hands so confusedly on the head of the candidate that he could not swear which had been the bishop.

† Columba of the cell, so called to distinguish him from his great namesake, who is usually called Columban.

dain" irresistibly suggests admission to an ecclesiastical ministry. He knows that it is no more requisite, nor indeed admissible, to translate *ordinare regem* "ordain a king" than to translate *ordinare consulem* "ordain a consul." Yet he thus mistranslates, evidently of set purpose, in order to avail himself of the unconscious effect of the word "ordain" upon English imaginations. And as the rank of king is supreme, he knows that by the same unconscious necessity, to those that are not on the watch, the supremacy of the regal rank will communicate itself to the supposed ordination, and minds will shape themselves in this way: "If the abbot of Iona could administer the highest of all ordinations, how much more easily that of a mere bishop!" And yet all this is a transparent sophism. A *rex ordinatus*, an inaugurated king, is admitted to not even the lowest ecclesiastical order. He remains absolutely a layman as before. A *regina ordinata*, an inaugurated queen, is incapable of order. Yet Dr. Killen, a minister of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, which is indissolubly associated in doctrine and testimony with her mother, the thrice illustrious Church of Scotland, has dared, for the sake of bringing in a mere controversial fallacy of the grossest kind, to abrogate the steadfast testimony of Presbyterianism against all confusion of the temporal and the spiritual order. How unworthy of a fellow-presbyter of Knox, of the Melvilles, of the royally descended and more than royally minded Robert Bruce! Who was it that said to a usurping monarch: "Sir, there are in Scotland two kingdoms and two kings. Of one kingdom James VI is the head. Of the other Jesus Christ is the head, and James VI is not the head, no, nor yet an office-bearer, but a simple member?" And yet, for the sake of setting a wretched trap of mere words, the author is content to turn his back on the august and steadfast testimony of his own great Church! In the eyes of all Churches, from Rome to Edinburgh, the right of instituting to the supreme temporal dignity is a matter of purely variable and human use, not implying the right to admit to even the humblest office of the spiritual order. Even in the days—long past—when the regal unction was accounted sacramental it was expressly likened to confirmation, which, even in the Latin Church, is often deputed to a simple presbyter. Let a priest be chosen pope, and he would instantly be competent,

by virtue of his supreme dignity, to hallow any king or emperor in the Catholic world.\* Yet he would not, until himself made bishop, have power to ordain even a subdeacon. Even the Church of England, so submissive to the regal authority, expressly declares that she does not attribute to the monarch the ministration of the word and sacraments. At a communion the queen receives after all the bishops, all the priests, all the deacons present. The youngest boy, just admitted to the lowest ministry, here precedes his sovereign. And with good right. Though highest in the temporal order, her majesty is, as a lay person, only fourth in the spiritual order. Nor is it otherwise in the nonsacerdotal Church of Scotland. When the queen joins in the communion at Balmoral, who receives the sacred elements first? The parish minister of Crathie. Who second? His assistant. Who third? Her majesty. The highest sovereignty on earth, in the eyes of every true Anglo-Celt and Anglo-Saxon, is hers. Yet in the spiritual order this daughter of a hundred kings has, even among these Puritan haters of Hildebrand, only the third place. So utterly unsubstantial is this author's supreme and conclusive argument, so utterly treacherous to the noblest traditions of the land of Knox.

In conclusion, the present writer wishes to remark that, as the Moravian Brethren say of themselves, the question of episcopal succession has for him not a doctrinal, but simply an historical, significance. Had Rome in the twelfth century really received a presbyterian ministry into the body of her priesthood, it would have indicated a great amount of spiritual enlightenment. This, however, appears to him to be strongly against historical probability and against multitudes of plain facts. If it is ever proved, it will have to be in some other way than through such a course of confused and confusing argument as that which Dr. Killen has not disdained to use.

\* Usage commonly requires previous consecration ; but usage only, not doctrinal necessity.

Charles C. Starbuck

## ART. IV.—THE HUMAN BODY IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE revival of the Olympic games during the last year in the city of Athens, and the award to the victors, made by the King of Greece, of the olive branch from historic Olympia, emphasize in the public mind the great esteem in which the human body was held by the ancient Greeks. All wars among the Greeks must cease while these famous games brought together in peaceful contests for physical supremacy those of pure Hellenic blood who, too frequently, were engaged in civil war. It was believed that the victories of Greece were really won in the Olympic, the Pythian, the Nemean, and Isthmian games, as Wellington declared that Waterloo was won at Eton and Rugby. But while the Greeks established these games in the name of religion and dedicated them to Jove and Apollo and Neptune, and prided themselves upon the perfection of the human form which was secured, the bodies of the victors were subject at death to cremation as really as the bodies of the peasants. In fact, cremation was accounted an honor which only suicides, unteethed children, and persons struck by lightning were denied. Grecian regard for the human body after death was less than what was common among the Egyptians, who embalmed their dead, the Jews, who buried them in sepulchers, and the Chinese, who buried them in the earth. Aside from these three nations cremation was universal until Christianity taught such reverence for the human body that some form of burial was generally introduced, the very catacombs in Rome being used, if they were not excavated, for that purpose.

However much esteemed in life, the human body had no future to those who knew nothing of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. Nor was it until the incarnation of our Lord that an adequate idea of the sacredness of the human body and of its glorious destiny ever entered the mind of man. Christ brought life and immortality to light, and made clear and unmistakable what had been before dimly conceived. But it needed his own resurrection to make this possible. After that, those who had doubted were so fully convinced that they boldly proclaimed the resurrection of Christ, "whom God raised

up, having loosed the pangs of death : because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." It is the right estimate of his body which alone renders possible a correct view of the teachings of Christianity respecting the human body. An erroneous view on this question has led many to doubt the reality of a future life and to deny the necessity of the atonement.

Our Lord put in the forefront of his teachings the final proof of his divinity which was to be given in the resurrection of his own body. His power over his own body, to raise it from the dead, challenges still the faith of the world. "What sign shonest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? . . . Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. . . . But he spake of the temple of his body." No language used by our Lord so deeply impressed the Jews, who quoted it against him at his trial. The temple belonged to the whole nation, and to no one tribe, the boundary line between Judah and Benjamin running through the middle of it. Of those coming to Jerusalem "none ever lacked means of celebrating the paschal festivities, nor had anyone lacked a bed on which to rest." Such was the boast of the rabbis ; and it helps to explain the desperate conduct of the Jews, who, while a trusted though unknown disciple could be depended on to furnish the upper room where Christ might celebrate the passover, themselves violated all the rites of their boasted hospitality by putting to death the Prince of Life. In his death agony on the cross he heard the railing of the multitude as they passed by and wagged their heads : "Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." Was anything more unlikely than that the quivering temple of his body, racked with pain and burning with thirst, should ever live again ? Yet, though he must shed his blood for his murderers, not one bone of that precious body could be broken, nor could his flesh ever see corruption.

The pencil of the architect has attempted the task of restoring on paper the temple which Julian the Apostate attempted in vain to restore in fact, and thus disprove the prophecy which predicted its final overthrow. The theme so inspiring to Ferguson has quickened the genius of many an architect until, following the minute descriptions given by sacred and secular writers, the noble structure as Solomon planned it and as

Zerubbabel and Herod rebuilt it has stood before us the most imposing temple of antiquity. When the emperor Justinian built the great Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople he brought columns from all the heathen temples of the world to support its dome, which rises one hundred and eighty feet above the floor. These one hundred and seventy columns of marble and granite and porphyry remain to-day to tell of the splendor of the temple which the emperor ever had in mind, as he sought, if possible, to surpass even the glory of the temple which Herod and his successors were eighty-two years in building. When Justinian had completed his work he was so impressed with its magnificent altar of gold and silver, adorned with all manner of precious stones, and with the stately proportions of the noble structure erected for Christian worship, that, rushing with outstretched arms from the entrance to the altar, he cried, "O Solomon, I have surpassed thee!" Like Solomon's temple, a king was its architect, and from afar came the costly stones which were to form part of the massive structure. So St. Mark's in Venice and the Washington Monument have been built of stones from distant lands or historic structures.

But the brush of the artist has attempted a nobler task than ever architect dared conceive, even to bring before us the matchless features of the body of the Son of man. From Leonardo and Raphael down to Dannecker and Hoffman this has been the lofty ambition of devout artists, to show us the Christ. They have succeeded in idealizing the human form as a vehicle of grace and truth, of noblest thoughts and tenderest sympathies. They have shown us what Christ is to them. But "there is a better Christ in every broken heart than can be found among the artistic treasures of man—a Christ full of sympathy, very pitiful and gracious, stooping with infinite condescension and counting no service mean."\* There is a kinship, too, between the devout soul and its Lord, which has been recognized in all ages and among all nations. The blood of all the race was in the veins of the Son of man, who had only a human mother, and whose ancestral line included such names as Thamar and Rahab, Ruth and Bathsheba, David and Mary. Gentile Moabitess and saintly Jew, kingly psalmist and peasant maiden, were among the ancestors of Jesus. In him all distinctions

\* Joseph Parker's *Paraclete*.



minge, for there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, for we are "all one in Christ Jesus." The first Adam was no more made of the dust of the earth, so that his body represented all that preceded him, than our Lord's body; the second Adam was made of the dust of our common humanity. From the ruins of the first great temple of humanity there was raised up this new temple, which did not need to be cleansed, because it was never defiled by sordid uses.

It was not manhood simply that Christ represented, but humanity. No more did other lands help to furnish the material for the great temple than had different people helped to fashion that body of the Son of man with its manly brain and womanly heart. In him we lose sight of time, of place, of earthly distinctions, of race and language. The wisest philosopher is instructed by his lips; while a Magdalene, delivered of seven devils, throws herself at his feet and cries, "Rabboni." Nicodemus, the ruler of the Jews, comes to learn of this teacher sent from God; while the nameless woman who was a sinner bathes his feet with her tears and is ready to sob, "Mother! Mother!" as she realizes more than a mother's forbearance and love from the friend of publicans and sinners. Old age, waiting for him in the temple, holds the child Jesus in its arms until his touch makes death easy, as the satisfied soul longs to depart in peace; while mothers see their infants folded to his heart, as he says, "Of such is the kingdom of God." The bravest remember the iron hardness with which he faced the tempter in the wilderness; and the most weary, his tired body resting at the well's mouth under a Syrian sun as he asks for a drink of water. He provided bread for the multitude with all of a woman's thoughtfulness, and with a sister's care calls his wearied disciples aside to rest a while, and yet faces a murderous mob with unquailing courage and calmly pronounces the doom of Jerusalem that stoned the prophets. The Lamb of God is the Lion of the tribe of Judah. Jesus of Nazareth, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, is the contemporary of all ages.

More than this: Jesus came saying, "A body hast thou prepared me." The body of Jesus, fashioned as a temple for the indwelling Holy Spirit, was prepared according to an ideal which had been in the mind of God from all eternity as the form in which his Son should become incarnate and which he

should bear back to the highest heavens. Jesus bore the human form not because men bore it; but men bear the human form because it was the form in which Christ was to appear when he should become flesh and we should behold "the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." It was a form fitted for the scenes of the transfiguration and the ascension that had been prepared for Christ. And it was a body such as was prepared for our Lord that was also prepared for Adam, a body which was to become a very temple for the divine shekinah; and while Christ comes in this body to show us what God is, he comes also to show us what man should be—man whose kinship is not with animals about him, but with Christ above him. Our true humanity is to be found in him. The purpose of God in humanity is to be found in the mission of the Son of man on earth. The destiny of humanity is to be traced as we see the ascending glorified body of our Lord, who is able to change the bodies of our humiliation and make them "like unto his own glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." His brethren are no more made like him, in being permitted to wear just such a body as was prepared for him from all eternity, than they are in being destined to become like him when they shall "see him as he is." The risen body of Christ now glorified confers on all partakers of flesh and blood a patent of nobility. It is in his risen and glorified manhood that Christ exercises the mighty power of subduing all things unto himself and changing our bodies until they shall become like his glorified body. It is to this risen and living Christ that we pray that our souls and bodies may be preserved unto everlasting life. Our very bread of life is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the living bread which came down from heaven.

We are led thus by the language of our Lord to consider what Liddon fitly called "the glorious destiny of the human body." It is a human body that Christ spoke of, which should become the first fruits of the resurrection and the pledge of our resurrection. If the first Adam became a living soul, with the power of continuing his posterity on earth, the second Adam became a quickening spirit, the very resurrection and the life. The human body was made for more than food, or clothing, or service in the industrial arts to some other animal made to have

dominion over it. It is a temple which, though connected with the earth and supported by it, lifts its head toward the stars and tells of the God who has built it and promises to make it his abode. Admire as we may the wonderful structure so many years in building, feast our eyes on the Beautiful Gate or on the vine of pure gold with clusters of gold, each of the height of a man, and all the votive offerings of a devout people, what is the Temple without an altar and offerings that tell of penitence and consecration, and without songs of praise that reach beyond its gilded towers?

The very completeness of the human body tells of higher uses than those which are simply animal and earthly. When an organism was reached through which thought was possible, nothing more was required of matter or was indeed possible to it. There are three distinct creative acts mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis; each is introduced by *bara*, to create, namely, the primordial creation of matter, the creation of animal life, and the creation of man. No scientific investigation has ever been able to find any shading off of the one into the other in such a way as to afford satisfactory proof that, however closely connected, animal life can come from that which is not animate, or that human life can come from any lower form of existence. Physically, man is the summary of all the perfections scattered through the animal kingdom, of which he is the head. He represents in his body, so fearfully and wonderfully made, the different forms of animal life which are below him. It would almost seem as if the Creator before modeling the human body had experimented on all conceivable adjustments of bone and muscle and nerve, to obtain the best that was possible when he should come to make man. It is not strange that, as in a great masterpiece we are reminded of the "studies" of the artist, so men find resemblances to the fish or to the higher forms of animal life which abound on the land when they study the human frame. They find seventy vestigial structures in the human body. Eminent anatomists like Dr. Cleland have been compelled to say, "Thus there is anatomical evidence that the development of the vertebrate form has reached its limits by completion in man." Nor have those who have made the nervous system a study been able to conceive of anything more perfect than our nervous organism. The propor-

tion of brain to the spinal cord rules the animal world, starting with the fish, with its proportion of two to one, until it reaches the mammal, with its proportion of four to one. Then, as if by a new creative act in fashioning man's physical frame, the proportion becomes twenty-three to one. It is not believed that any substantial difference will ever be made to appear. The dome of the human skull, with its curve of one hundred and eighty degrees from front to base, expresses the mind of the Creator as to the completeness of man's frame. With expansion of height or width would come a curvature or bending on itself, so that the base would be crumpled together while the roof is elongated. Abnormal development usually awakens great fear of attendant insanity, as a dwarfed brain is the badge of imbecility. Curving of the base of the skull involves a change in the position of the bones of the face which would require the cutting off the nasal cavity from the throat. There is such adjustment as shows that God has in the human body expressed his last thought in matter. The Greeks, with their love of beauty, found its highest expression in the human form. They saw the ideal face divided into three equal parts by the line of the eyes and the mouth. They saw the extended arms equal to the height of the entire body. They found such proportions as revealed the perfect harmony which is the essence of beauty, and that these proportions were not capable of disturbance in the interest of perfection. The human form cut in marble by the Grecian sculptor has served as the model for centuries, and to maintain these right proportions was ever kept before the contestants in the Olympic games. To the Greeks there was but one word for both the noble and the beautiful. A noble man, a perfect man, was an harmonious man. Religion degenerated into the arts. The artist who achieved a beautiful statue was almost worshiped. The very gods were sculptured in the likenesses of men, and not made many-headed or hundred-handed, as Hindu gods. It was the old story of the power of sensuous beauty, the witchery of form and color, of music, of architecture, to produce a semireligious feeling. It was doubtless the best, the most perfect of its kind, and it is the best which satisfies us. The Greeks worshiped humanity, of which the physical man is the type and expression.

But, under the conditions where mere animal life becomes

more luxuriant human life grows less so ; that is, near the equator. In Africa four fifths of the country is in the tropics, and in South America, five sixths ; and while ferns become trees and grass grows into bamboo forests sixty to seventy feet high, and while a single tree is a garden where a hundred different plants intertwine their branches and display their flowers, and while animal life is marked at once by lofty stature, variety, and brilliant colors, man is seen at his worst. The history of the race is the history of temperate regions. The tropics have only an exotic history, the history of conquerors from regions more favorable to the development at once of man's physical and intellectual nature. The dwarfs of equatorial Africa are so repulsive as to seem to belong to some other than the human race. But where is mere animal or vegetable life more luxuriant than where these beings shoot their poisoned arrows and dig their treacherous pitfalls ? It is not physical nature which develops man, but the struggle against nature. A mere animal with the form of an Apollo Belvidere, if without a soul, could awaken only pity ; while a scarred and maimed veteran, the hero of a hundred battles, would be borne upon the shoulders of a shouting multitude, who would proudly be eyes and limbs and ears to his martial soul. This shows the real purpose of the human body—it is the vehicle of the human soul, not of the mere animal soul, whose chief concern is food, self-defense, and the continuation of the species. In man the animal is arrested, that the spirit may grow. The highest possibilities open to flesh and bone, nerve and muscle, have been realized. Nature has come to consciousness in man. The soul comes to look upon the body as its tool and for holding other tools which human intelligence may devise.

Thoughtful men since Galen's time have long admired the human hand and the human eye. The hand of man seems made for the brush, the chisel, the pencil, the pen, the sword, the scepter. Jointed at the shoulder, elbow, wrist, how varied its uses as the handler of tools ! The thumb opposite each finger endows the hand with its capacity. Man's is the ultimate hand. None better can be conceived. Henceforth it depends on its skill with tools in making man able to arrest the speed of the deer or subdue and control the strength of the horse. Wonderful as is the human eye, its achievements depend on the skill of the human hand. Future improvements

in sight will not depend on muscle and nerve and tissue, with their liability to waste and pain. The hand offers its aid to the eye, with appliances of crystal and metal which may increase the power of vision, bring near the distant, and resolve mere points of light into double or triple stars. The body is thus complete as the vehicle and the tool of the human soul. It ceases to be an end and becomes a means. There is nothing more for the animal in us to hope for, aside from the soul. The real growth is that of the rational soul, and the very animal soul becomes a servant while none the less a partner.

But the human body is more than the temple of a rational soul. It is the temple of the Holy Spirit. Christianity teaches that through the human body the moral world is planted in the material world to subdue it and uplift it. Even Plato held that the soul was compelled to tenant the body as a sort of punishment. He saw the time of the soul taken in feeding the body, in warming it, in clothing it, and in resting it. The Gnostics and Essenes held that all matter was only evil, and were of the opinion that the soul was defiled by contact with a human body. It was only by constant bathings and purifications that the body could be tolerated. In opposition to all this hatred of the body Christianity comes in and teaches us to reverence it as the temple of the Holy Ghost, not simply the temple of a human soul. Burial was deliberately substituted for cremation throughout the pagan world, wherever Christianity went. Children who were deformed or diseased were no longer exposed to death. Sensuality and suicide began to disappear before the holy religion that taught the voluptuous Corinthians and the no less sensual Romans that "neither fornicators, . . . nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God." It was not simply necessary to purify the body with water, but it must be kept free from all defilement through "fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." Because the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost it should be kept in temperance, in soberness, in chastity.

It was not only for the use of the human soul that Christianity taught reverence for the body, but for the use of the Holy Spirit. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile



the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." What appeals were made to our Lord by men possessed of devils—evil spirits which usurped the place of God in the human body, bestializing men until they made their abode in graveyards among the tombs, like wild animals, or were bound with chains. No more grateful disciple ever worshiped his divine Lord than the Gadarene whose evil possessions were numbered by the legion, and who exchanged his fetters and tormenting demons for liberty and peace, and published throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done for him.

Why were nearly all of our Lord's miracles done on behalf of the human body? Why did he still tempests when men were in peril, and feed multitudes when they were faint? Why did the palsied and blind seek his healing touch, and sightless balls turn where his voice was heard, and importunate souls cry, "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me?" Why did lepers beseech, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," and messengers hurry across the Jordan with the tidings, "He whom thou lovest is sick?" Why twice a miraculous draught of fishes for his hungry disciples, and why the feeding of five thousand, deemed of so great importance that it is the one miracle recorded by all four of the evangelists? Did our Lord teach us to despise the human body, or to cherish it? Did he come to destroy life, or to save it? When only the relatives of the dead touched the corpse, because of ceremonial defilement, our Lord's hand was laid thereon with its life-giving touch, and the dead rose at his command for new life and service. It was for this that he restored sight and hearing and health and reason and life, that we might glorify God in our bodies, which are his. No more was our Lord's own body a temple of the Holy Ghost, which came upon him at the Jordan and abode with him in all that wonderful ministry, than are our bodies temples of the Holy Ghost. The true shekinah is a holy man. "We will come unto him, and make our abode with him." It is for this reason we regard the world's great seers as inspired men, whose consecrated genius itself is called a spark of the divine fire. There is no divinity in nature without men.

Constituted as man is, the union of spirit and body is necessary to a perfect life. The alliance is a natural one between

body and spirit. For this reason we are repelled by a corpse ; we are frightened by a spirit. The very spirits of the departed await the resurrection because, without us, they shall not be made perfect. Death is a disturbance of the relation between spirit and body so necessary to constitute man in his completeness. Christianity shows that relation reestablished through the resurrection of the body. Its defiant cry, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" is only another form of the Saviour's utterance, "Destroy this temple, and . . . I will raise it up." We who have the first fruits of the Spirit "groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." The soul first knows itself through the body, and even "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" shines only "in the face of Jesus Christ." Perfect humanity becomes the vehicle of divinity to man. The adoration of the beautiful is not worship ; we must reverence the good, the union of the divine and human, in Christ. God reveals himself, not in physical nature, but in human nature.

The Scriptures take peculiar pains to assure us of the continuance of the humanity of our Lord. We are permitted to see his risen body in all his ten appearances until his ascension. Our ascended High Priest, with a heart of human sympathy, but of infinite reach, can be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities." How much more than any father delights to give good gifts to his children will He delight to help us who wept with the sisters at Bethany, healed the spots of the leper, and was the universal friend of sinners ! Our humanity, perfected and glorified, gives our best conception of heaven.

Just with what body the dead are raised up we cannot say, nor need we be much concerned. The soul which knows how to use the brain and nerves may find something of a yet more refined and spiritual substance in the spiritual body which it shall wear. Carbon has yet more brilliant combinations in the diamond than appear in the charcoal, but a worker in charcoal all his life may never have seen a diamond. The only two conditions of organized life are these : an organ connecting the individual with the past, and such a frame and such a universe that he has the power of varied action in the present. It is thus a question of the power of God over our bodies to change them from the bodies of our humiliation and make them like the

glorious body of the Son of God, which was endowed and interpenetrated with some of the properties of the Spirit ere its ascension. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." But it is the union between the soul and body that makes the perfect, the complete, man. Hence in every dispensation there was given a sample pledge of the resurrection. In the patriarchal age it was Enoch. In the Levitical dispensation it was probably Moses. In the prophetic age it was Elijah. In the Christian age, and for all times to come, it was the glorious body of our Lord. The principle of continuity and the doctrine of a future life go together. Nothing has been better established in our day than the conservation and correlation of force. Matter may undergo countless changes, and yet it cannot be annihilated. Out of the same dust whence was formed the original human body, the Creator can form such bodies as our spirits require for the completeness of our life hereafter. Our Lord gives to each seed a body as it pleases him, and much more will he give to us the right body, for it will be like his glorified body, "according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

Pope in pleasing numbers gives us the emperor Hadrian's address to his soul when dying. But it is not the body which takes farewell of the soul at death. Such a notion is essentially pagan. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." It is his real self which lights up with the very consciousness of immortality. We have bodies, but we are spirits. The invisible is the real and the enduring. We need therefore a Christian poet who shall write the soul's farewell to the body until the two shall be reunited to make the perfect man, as this mortal shall put on immortality. There is no divinity in nature without man, and man is divine as he is an expression alike in his soul and body of the very mind and purpose of God. The humanity of Christ is the Spirit's perfect work in creation, and exhibits how every faculty of our human nature, spiritual, intellectual, and physical, may be enlisted and vitalized by the divine energy. It is the perfect union of spirit and body, the body so responsive to the spirit, and both so obedient to God, that none of the slower processes of the laboratory of the grave are necessary to render the body more capable for

the heavenly duties, when the spirit shall be clothed upon with a spiritual body more quick to obey the behests of the Spirit than the electric fluid is to obey the will of man. Such complete union appeared between the spirit and body of our Lord, during the forty days after his resurrection, that the very laws of gravitation were reversed as the ascending spirit took the body, also, from Olivet, until the bright cloud received him out of sight.

The Christian religion thus teaches reverence for the human body as the most perfect of the divine creations and designed to be the vehicle of divinity itself. Part of the mission of the Son of man was to relieve its diseases and disabilities; and the credentials of our religion which have most impressed the heathen, as in the case of Li Hung Chang, are loving ministries to the sick and bedridden, the deaf and blind, the lepers and the insane. Christianity has lengthened human life, not only by proper care of the young and helpless, but by better sanitation, by more nourishing food, by more perfect knowledge of the needs of the human body, and more skill in ministering to them. Pestilence and famine have long since been virtually confined to the Mohammedan or heathen world, where medicines and supplies are eagerly sent from Christian lands. The horror of defiling the temple of the Holy Ghost has diminished in Christian lands the sensualities and nameless sins against the human body which Paul denounces in his Roman epistle. The belief in the resurrection of the body has led to greater care for its proper burial, until our cemeteries are like gardens where our Lord's body was laid awaiting the resurrection. The reunion of soul and body in our complete resurrection life settles for us the perplexing question as to the very possibility of any life after death, and becomes the inspiration of ceaseless activities here. It is only those who have felt the force of Paul's overwhelming "Wherefore" who are found "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord," forasmuch as they know that their labor "is not in vain in the Lord."

Engines R. Olney,

ART. V.—WHY PREACHERS SHOULD STUDY  
BROWNING.

It is scarcely needful at this late day, after all that has been written and spoken about Browning, that we take up the general question of his place in the world of letters or the importance of his contributions to modern thought. This work has been well done during the past dozen years by a variety of most competent hands. The labors of the Browning Society in England, founded in 1881 and broken up in 1893, were especially effective in this direction; and in America men like Professor Hiram Corson and Mr. George Willis Cooke, together with others of similar high standing, have left the reading public no excuse for failing to know how mighty a genius passed from earth when Robert Browning went away, December 12, 1889. Among the brief tributes fitly paid him by the highest critical authorities we simply cite the following four:

The profoundest intellect, with widest range of sympathies, and with universal knowledge of men and things, that has arisen as a poet since Shakespeare.

Preeminently the greatest Christian poet we have ever had; a teacher who is as thrilled through with all Christian sympathies as with artistic or musical.

The poet of thoughtful persons, essentially the exponent of the best movements of English mind in this age.

Browning's poetry embodies the profoundest thought, the most complex sentiment, and, above all, the most quickening spirit of the age.

These culled characterizations, which might be indefinitely extended, may seem exaggerated to those who have not as yet come under the sway of the influence they so imperfectly portray. But, by those who have learned to love the productions of this great master, they will be recognized as in no way overdrawn. It is not our purpose, however, to attempt an elaborate discussion either of the poet or his poems, but rather, in a brief, quiet way, to note some reasons why ministers, in particular, should study Browning, and to point out some benefits which will accrue to them from the effort.

I. The study of Browning will enlarge their vocabulary. It

is mentioned by Mrs. Sutherland Orr, in her *Life and Letters* of the poet, that as a primary qualification for his literary pursuits he read and digested in early life the whole of Johnson's Dictionary. One can readily believe it. "People accuse me of not taking pains," he said in later years; "I take nothing but pains." He devoted the most conscientious labor to the perfection of his work, and the knowledge he exhibits of the capacities of the English language is certainly marvelous. No one can read him understandingly without a pretty frequent consultation of large lexicons. And it is not so much the unusual number of rare words that deserves emphasis as it is their subtle quality and the happy selection of strong, pictorial expressions which flash the thought and gleam with light. Browning was not satisfied with common terms. He picked out those choice, condensed vocables which hold whole sentences in solution, and live in the memory because they are windows through which a landscape laughs or stilettoes that strike a victim dead. Specimens? Here is a handful:

"Stung by the splendor of a sudden thought." "Pedestaled in triumph." "The motley, merchandising multitude." "The puissance of the tongue." "Mute in the midst, the whole man one amaze." "Lamb-pure, lion-brave." "Cold glories served up with stale fame for sauce." "Some wonder of a woman's heart." "The straight backbone thought of a crooked speech." "Worn threadbare of soul by forty-six years of rubbing on hard life." "Not by the grandeur, God, but by the comfort, Christ." "A good girl, with the velvet in her voice." "Silenced the scruple between soul and sense." "The stone strength of white despair." "Lean, pale, proud insignificance." "Wormy ways, the indirect, unapproved of God." "Unimaginative ignorance." "Cloudlets scudding under the bare blue." "All one couch of crassitude." "Hell, eruptive and fuliginous." "Diamond, slipping flame from fifty slants." "Pearl, that great round glory of pellucid stuff, a fish-secreted round, a grain of grit."

One can scarcely read these, and hundreds of similar sentences, without having his verbal taste decidedly refined. He will be more apt in his choice of words, satisfied with nothing but the best. He may not think it worth while to read through the Century or the Standard Dictionary, but he will be on the watch, wherever he does read, for terms crowded with significance. He will become an artist in language, skillful in applying literary color, a discernor of the beautiful and the terrible in speech. To compass an acquirement of this sort one may



well spend laborious days and meditative nights. For it is the power of making one's thought pass with swiftness into the minds of other men, and hook itself to their souls.

II. It will beautify their style. Browning is no mere poet of prettiness, taken up with dainty devices and idle conceits. He is too great for that. He is not a maker of rhymes, or a turner of phrases, but an interpreter of life. He distinctly rebelled at the too prevalent demand for jingle to which many poets have unbecomingly succumbed, and he absolutely refused in any case to subordinate sense to sound. Thought with him was the main thing, and if matter or form had to be sacrificed, he always let the latter go. The popular clamor that everything must be smooth and sweet and easy was an offense to him, and he voiced his protest against this by a frequent ruggedness and harshness of verse that has been something of a stumbling-block to many readers. They complained loudly of his obscurity. Obscure—chiefly because of the great condensation employed, and the wealth of recondite allusion used, as well as the abrupt transitions—very much of his work unquestionably is. He says himself, in a private letter, in 1868:

I can have little doubt that my writing has been in the main too hard for many that I should have been pleased to communicate with. But I never designedly tried to puzzle people, as some of my critics have supposed. On the other hand, I never pretended to offer such literature as should be a substitute for a cigar or a game of dominoes to an idle man. So, perhaps, on the whole, I get my deserts, and something over; not a crowd, but a few I value more.

But while in the general tenor of his poetry he is a seer rather than a singer, differing in this from the common run of rhymers, a painter dealing with the eye rather than a musician dealing with the ear, he knows well how to put rich melody into his lines when there is real call for it in the meaning which he would convey. His subjects are rarely such as readily admit of musical treatment. They more generally demand the grand, deep roll of the ocean instead of the merry tinkle of purling, babbling brooks. He does not sing of happy days in leafy June so often as of harsh December's pelting storms. Nevertheless, the "concord of sweet sounds" is very manifest and very attractive in many of the poems. So that both he who strives to grasp greater strength of expression and he who aims

at harmonious numbers, a liquid diction, and a fluid movement, will find abundant help in the study of Browning. What, for example, can be more mellifluous than the opening verses of "Fifine at the Fair:"

O trip and skip, Elvire! Link arm in arm with me!  
Like husband and like wife, together let us see  
The tumbling troop arrayed, the strollers on their stage,  
Drawn up and under arms, and ready to engage.

They pace and promenade; they presently will dance;  
What good were else i' the drum and fife? O pleasant land of France!

Note also the poem beginning, "Over the sea our galleys went." Indeed, from the immense mass of Browning's productions—the largest since Shakespeare—a good-sized volume could easily be compiled that should supremely illustrate beauty; and he who wishes to read mainly for the cultivation of this element can easily confine himself for a season to poems of this sort, for they are plentiful. And whoever thus trains his ear to appreciate the proper balance of a sentence and the true martial movement in words has distinctly added to his power, whether for writing or speaking. If the arrow of truth be feathered aright it will go the straighter to its mark.

III. It will stimulate their imagination and kindle their emotion. For these are chief constituents in all true poetry. It makes a demand upon the imagination in its perusal, because only by the vivid and prolonged exercise of that power can it be produced, and, similarly, the reading it arouses feeling, for only when facts are intensified and sublimated by feeling do they grow poetic. Rhyme and rhythm do not constitute poetry. The vehicle of expression is always of less importance than the thought expressed. If emotion and imagination are lacking, whatever the form of language, it cannot be called other than prose. The question with reference to any piece of writing which claims to be a poem is, What inspiring quality has it, does it stir to great deeds, does it reveal the inmost side of truth, has it glow and thrill, or comfort and sustaining power? If there be a creative spirit in it; if deepest feeling be idealized and monumentalized; if it be suffused with the white heat of passion, or so surcharged with sentiment that it transports us into the higher regions of human experience; if it be, as

Matthew Arnold says it should, "thought and art in one;" if it contain, as Wordsworth declares essential, "the breath and fever spirit of all knowledge," then we may call it poetry, even though the technical rules for such construction are audaciously or magnificently ignored.

A poet is thinker, feeler, artist combined. He is a man who "sees the infinite in things," who, by his imagination, gets nearer to the heart of life and penetrates closer to the core of truth than the cool reasoner or the scientific investigator. He is a man of intuition, insight, and genius, an inspired man in the best sense, magnetic to God, and a prime medium for divine communications to the world. A great poet must have a great intellect, capable of comprehending the deepest problems of man's relation to the universe; he must also have a very exceptional susceptibility to impressions from all conceivable quarters, together with such a command of musical speech that he can easily turn these impressions into durable, beautiful, and visible, if not vendible, verse.

Such, in the most emphatic sense, was Robert Browning. Is it not evident, then, that to con his conceptions, to think his thoughts after him, to catch the swing and sweep of his majestic pinions, must tend to develop those germs of poetry lying latent in nearly all of us, and give exercise to those highest faculties which are in no little danger of becoming dwarfed or shriveled by lack of use in the hurrying pressure of life's dull daily drudgery? Browning's imagination, it may perhaps fairly be said, did not soar so loftily and steadily as that of some other poets has soared, because he exerted it mainly upon real things, upon the thoughts and feelings of human beings. He was not visionary, but intensely practical. All the more, on this account, is it thoroughly wholesome to follow the leadings of his mind, and through the glowing golden gates of imagination and emotion enlarge one's acquaintance both with the world without and the world within.

IV. It will increase their knowledge of human nature. As just intimated, Browning dwells for the most part upon the internal, rather than the external. His main work is the analysis and portraiture of personal character, of human life, past, present, and to come—an analysis of the most subtle kind, reaching to the inmost impulses of the heart, and a portraiture that

brings before us the most vivid, as well as most picturesque, images. He is the "poet of psychology," from whom human nature has no secrets. It has been well said that the subtitle of most of his poems might be "incidents in the development of a soul." It was clearly his chief calling to paint the souls of men; to pursue, through all the winding mazes of the mind, the elusive motive; to catch the shifting fancies and celestial, or infernal, lights. The soul seemed to him the one thing best worthy of study, the one thing of intensest interest. He was fascinated by it, and by the spectacle of man seeking his destiny amid the countless combinations of circumstances and conditions that confront or surround him. He has been often likened to Shakespeare, because of this absorption in human nature with all its varieties of good or ill, and because of his power to throw himself into the most diverse individualities and to think and feel as they would in the situations depicted.

His favorite method, followed through nearly all the longer poems and many of the shorter ones, is monodramatic—not truly dramatic, where a number of characters appear upon the stage, each speaking in his own person and directly affecting the welfare of the rest; nor yet after the nature of soliloquy, where a single individual speaks to himself alone; but something between. In the monodrama, while one person does the speaking he speaks in the presence of others, addressing them, so that their thoughts and words as well as his own come freely out, in one way or another, during the course of the narration. The story is told, in every case, not for the mere incident, but for the unfolding of passion and the play of feeling. And the poet's preeminent genius appears in the wide range of characters through which, with consummate skill, he speaks. How broad must be the sympathies, how keen the observation, how deep the insight into human nature of one who can so completely identify himself with hundreds of separate and dissimilar persons, entering into their most private thoughts and ardently defending their doings from their own point of view! In his masterpiece, "The Ring and the Book"—which marks the high tide of his poetic insight, the zenith of his literary power, contains twenty-one thousand one hundred and sixteen lines, and is called by the *Athenæum* not only "the supremest poetic achievement of the time," but also "the most profound

and precious spiritual treasure that England had produced since the days of Shakespeare"—he tells the story of a Roman murder, as one half Rome sees it, then as the other half regards it; then he gives the medium view as to why the things happened thus; then sets forth the villainous murderer's side; then the side of the hero of the plot; next the heroine states her version of the facts; then the attorney for the defense takes up the tale, followed by the attorney for the prosecution, after which the pope as final judge reviews the case; and, lastly, the criminal once more pleads his cause. It is safe to say that no other single poem, perhaps no other equal number of verses, shows such close familiarity with the workings of the mind and heart of man, or contains such plentiful material for enlarging one's acquaintance with the human soul.

V. It will tighten their moral grip. Among the trials to which ministers are distinctly, if not especially, exposed is the temptation to lower their standard for the sake of heightening their popularity. The world around them constantly demands conformity to itself as the price of its favor. And while the young man starts out with a high ideal to which he proposes to lift others, confident that he will never show a white feather in the fight, it is found after a while that in most cases he weakens before the solid masses of the foe and consents to compromise, that he may gain peace or position or profit—a sad history, continually recurring. Browning was confronted by this danger. It stood squarely across his path. Did he yield? Not for an instant. There are few facts in the history of literature more remarkable and significant than the treatment meted out for half a century to this peerless poet. The British public, as he pathetically remarks, liked him not. All his earlier poems were published at his father's expense, and proved a financial loss. And many years subsequently, when he had found a publisher, the report from that firm for a certain six months was that not a single copy of his works had been sold. His friends, especially his devoted and gifted wife, were exceedingly indignant over this neglect. But it never seems to have troubled the poet himself. He made no complaints. Still less did it induce him to modify in the slightest degree that message and method which he profoundly felt God had in-

trusted to him for his age. Not till the publication of "The Ring and the Book," in 1868, was there any adequate recognition of his genius, even by critical minds, and his wide acceptance was still far in the future. But, as to this, he was little concerned. Writing to a friend in the last decade of his life, when larger praise had come, he says: "As I never felt inconvenienced by hard words, you will not expect me to wax bumptious because of undue compliment." On another occasion he wrote: "As I began, so I shall end, taking my own course, pleasing myself, or aiming to do so, and thereby I hope pleasing God. As I never did otherwise, I never had any fear as to what I did going ultimately to the bad." He never would consent to conciliate public opinion at the expense of what he felt to be the true principles of his art. He kept calmly on his way, and patiently waited for the justification which he was sure would eventually come. He was willing to bide his time. He maintained his right to be himself, not a pale copy of somebody else. He said straight out what was in his mind, in the way in which it presented itself and after the style natural to him, without inquiring closely whether the people would sustain him or not. His independence is refreshing. And he conquered, as every such man must conquer, give him scope enough. He cared nothing for success in the ordinary, worldly meaning of that term. To have a right aim, a lofty ideal, and to be unswervingly true to it under all circumstances seemed to him the only real success. No failure is possible to such. He counted that the only failure consisted in doing less than one's best. He held it "better to have failed in the high aim than vulgarly in the low aim succeed." "It is not what a man does which exalts him, but what a man would do," he said. And again, "What I am, what I am not, in the eye of the world, is what I never cared for much." He moved steadfastly on, regarding very little the praise or blame of his fellows, untouched by the world's voices, in a higher, diviner atmosphere. He has much to say about "the chivalry that dares the right and disregards alike the yea and nay o' the world."

Aspire, and break bounds! I say,  
 Endeavor to be good, and better still,  
 And best! Success is naught, endeavor's all.



There is no duty patent in the world  
 Like daring try be good and true myself,  
 Leaving the shows of things to the lord of show  
 And prince o' the power of the air.

And still more beautifully comes out this thrilling thought, still more brilliantly flames this fervent faith, in his very last poem, the "Epilogue" to "Asolando," written just before his death-illness. After reading it from a proof to his daughter-in-law and sister he said, "It almost looks like bragging to say this, and as if I ought to cancel it; but it's the simple truth, and, as it's true, it shall stand." Here are the words:

What had I on earth to do  
 With the slothful, with the mawkish, the unmanly?  
 Like the aimless, helpless, hopeless, did I drivel,  
     Being—who?  
 One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward,  
     Never doubted clouds would break,  
 Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,  
 Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,  
     Sleep to wake.

We see not how anyone can enter into the spirit of such lines as these here quoted, together with many others of similar import which he wrote, without having his grip perceptibly tightened on the fundamental moral axiom that duty is to be done, and truth spoken without faltering, whether men will hear or forbear. No preacher can lower his banner, or strike his flag to fear, who stamps these words upon his brain and drinks from the cup of him who first set them forth. Appreciated or not, recompensed or ridiculed, promoted or relegated to the rear, the genuine hero will stand to his guns and fire his last shot with as straight an aim as the first, cheerfully leaving his vindication to God. One might bend long over Browning and feel well repaid if something of this power passed into him.

VI. It will strengthen their religious faith. Browning's whole being is wrapped round the central thought of God. The most vital thing in his conception of man is his relation to duty. The visible universe is but a veil scarce covering the ever-present, all-important unseen world. Says one, "He never loses consciousness of the supreme eternal will, the intelligent first cause underlying all manner of systems of causation." Another said, "Take away the religious tissue from Browning's

tapestry with its vast variety of figures, and almost everyone would be a *caput mortuum*." "Forward to the infinite," is his cry; in this tabernacle life no rest can be found. He asserts the eternal reality of the soul as the most vital truth that can come within the ken of man. There can be no doubt that he is the most thoroughly Christian of all our great poets. Mr. James Thomson, an avowed atheist, belonging to the Browning Club, wrote:

I must not fail to note, as one of the most remarkable characteristics of his genius, his profound, passionate, loving, and triumphant faith in Christ, and in the immortality and ultimate redemption of every human soul in and through Christ. Thoroughly familiar with all modern doubts and disbeliefs, he trampled them all under foot, clinging to the cross; and this with the full cooperation of his peerless reason, not in spite of it and by its absolute surrender and suppression.

Dr. Edward Berdoe, as he himself narrates in the beginning of his recently published volume, *Browning and the Christian Faith*, was converted from Agnosticism to Christianity by the study of Browning. He also relates that a student at one of the theological schools once consulted a divinity lecturer as to the best books on modern theology which he could present to a skeptical friend. And the prompt, decisive answer came, "Give him a set of Browning." Such a one would find blazing on almost every page of the voluminous works, in one form or another, the declaration, "I believe in God." And he would see that this life, according to the poet, could in no way be explained, except with close reference to the life beyond. The unity and continuity of life, together with its magnificent meaning as a place and instrument of discipline, everywhere shines forth. Browning never hesitated to say, or clearly imply, that God alone is responsible for all the trials and sufferings of our mortal existence, and that no one of them could be dispensed with in view of the end for which we were created. He will have it that no experience is wasted, that the perfection of character is the one result that never need fail; whether our work is to rule a kingdom, or sweep a crossing, or lie on a sick bed, character is ever being upbuilt. Hence life is well worth living, come what may. Failure here is a pledge of success there. Browning seems to bend all his energies to casting out the demon of pessimism. It is in this, perhaps, most of

all, that his influence has proved so gloriously wholesome and splendidly sane, a tonic of the healthfulest sort, full of refreshment, invigoration, and inspiration. One more persistently and invincibly optimistic in his faith, one more suffused with hopefulness and high trust, it would be very hard to find or conceive. He is perpetually saying, in substance, to the despondent and downhearted: "Courage, the battle shall yet be retrieved; dare seem to fail, for only thus, by calm endurance and loyalty to high aims, shall you reach true success and prove yourself a coworker with the Almighty; come not down from the cross till he gives the word, and you shall have the crown." Such teaching must make men stronger, more earnest, truer to their better selves, more genuinely Christian in the large, substantial, vital way which alone is of primary importance. We would like to fill many pages with quotations embodying these truths, but a few must suffice:

God's in his heaven—  
All's right with the world.

Let one more attest,  
I have lived, seen God's hand through a lifetime,  
And all was for best.

I trust in God—the right shall be the right,  
And other than the wrong, while he endures.

This world's no blot for us, nor blank;  
It means intensely, and means good.

I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ  
Accepted by the reason solves for thee all questions  
In the life and out of it.

But where will God be absent? In his face  
Is light, but in his shadow healing too.

I find earth not gray, but rosy;  
Heaven not grim, but fair of hue;  
Do I stoop? I pluck a posy.  
Do I stand and stare? All's blue.

Then welcome each rebuff that turns life's smoothness rough,  
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!  
Be our joys three parts pain! Strive and hold cheap the strain  
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe.

VII. It will acquaint them with a charming character. No space can here be given to an extended sketch of the poet's life; but when we say that the life was every way worthy of the

work, and stands squarely behind the poems, we have said very nearly enough. He is described by his biographer as having been, in early years, "passionately religious," and, though this feeling became modified later, God was throughout his days the center of all things to him. This strong religious bent came chiefly from his mother, born and brought up in the Kirk of Scotland, a thoroughly evangelical Christian, and, according to her son, "a divine woman." He loved her with an intense devotion rarely seen. His relations with his wife, the marvelously gifted Elizabeth Barrett, were of a similar ideal sort. They almost worshiped each other. He was capable of the largest self-sacrifice and the smallest self-denial, and would exercise either whenever love or duty clearly pointed the way. He was a Liberal in politics, fond of society, a brilliant talker, and especially at home with clergymen. He believed in a direct divine Providence and in making a virtue of happiness. There was no quality he so loved and admired as truth.

He will always remain, perhaps, the poet of the few, one for whom a love must be acquired by some study. He is too unconventional, makes too great a demand upon thought, mixes too little water with his ink to suit the many. He is not shallow enough to be popular. But one can scarcely understand the age in which we live who does not understand Browning. He is the best interpreter of our time, uttering our needs and our aspirations, our fears and our faith. He is a great prophet, who spoke in numbers because he felt that poetry is the appointed vehicle for all lasting truths and inspiring thoughts. He is a philosopher, profoundly interpreting the main problems of human existence. As a poet he stands apart, a unique figure, with no forerunner, no successor, an original force in literature. No one can read him diligently without great benefit to both intellect and heart. The profound personal indebtedness to him expressed by his admirers, and their intense devotedness, are most significant. The keynote of his teaching is love. Love and faith are the instruments of his analysis and the explanations of his wonderful insight into character. Love, art, and religion are his principal themes. How manly, robust, energetic, and wide-awake his thought! They who sit at his feet are helped by him to understand the meaning of life, are enriched in their sympathies and broadened in their views. He

always sees a soul of good in things evil, and shows how God's purposes are being wrought out by means the most unpromising. When he looks at criminals, of whom there are many in his pages, he looks deeper than their crimes. He finds evidence of the divine presence in all the various entanglements of human doings, and in individual souls of every sort. At the heart of much that passes for wickedness he perceives a germ of good, and notes the pulsations of the life of the Highest in all history. "Hardly any conception is more prominent in Browning's writings," says Professor Henry Jones, of St. Andrew's University, "than this of endless progress toward an infinite ideal; he recognizes that growing knowledge is an essential condition of growing goodness." In other words, he holds that perfect love would be perfect knowledge, and perfect knowledge perfect love, no separation being possible.

Says Dr. Alexander McLaren, the great Manchester preacher, who is an enthusiastic student of Browning: "In wealth of genius, in loftiness of reach, in intensity of creative imagination I know of nothing to compare with the highest work of Browning. The crowd of men and women, alive and tingling to their finger-tips, whom he has made, are only paralleled by Shakespeare's. There is nobody else that can stand beside him." And Owen Meredith has voiced the feelings of all who are best fitted to pronounce judgment, when he writes of him as one

Than whom a mightier master never  
Touched the deep chords of hidden things;  
Nor error did from truth dissever  
With keener glance, nor make endeavor  
To rise on bolder wings,  
In those high regions of the soul  
Where thought itself grows dim with awe.

*James Mudge.*

## ART. VI.—THE PERMANENT AND PROGRESSIVE IN HOMILETICS.

ACCORDING to some men the pulpit is an institution, and no more. As others look at it they see only an evolution. The former view, if pressed to its extreme limits of restraint of liberty, would have no message for the new day that it could understand; and the latter would abolish the pulpit when, on an evil day, the low-flying arrow of an unexpected foe had cut the vulnerable heel of the otherwise invincible warrior. But we need have little fear of this. For the "Achilles tendon" of the pulpit has been not bathed at the Styx but baptized at Pentecost. Yet the truth is somewhere between the two extremes. An institution may be none the less an appointed method for tremendous results, if at the same time it is to have an unceasing unfolding of powers, such as could not have been expected in the initial stages of the enterprise. The world is a changing one, and the old power must be supplied with new channels. We shall be sure of ultimate victory only as we give an ever-widening compass to the words of the Master, "into all the world." There is more to go into than when the order was first given.

Our duty is to watch the unfolding plans of God, and to make as plain to our day as possible the relation of the old that is ever new to the new that grows older and more useless each passing day. The old man with the scythe is evermore taking off the top and leaving the roots ready for a fresh growth. The green field of our race growth is in constant need of a removal of the surplus, and so is able to guarantee the larger crop to follow by reason of the new and unencumbered energy that fills every fiber of the fruit-bearing life. The question for the present-day pulpit is to find out what is the upper growth of homiletics that is to be discarded, and how to put to finer uses the homiletic matter and root principles with which we confront a day our fathers desired to look into and could not.

Is there such a thing as a "universal homiletic?" The complete answer to this would carry us beyond allowable limits; but one could scarcely measure a more fundamental question, nor one more far-reaching, to put to a man anxious to



preach the word of life to his fellow-men. In the effort to find the proper answer to what so much concerns us we stand up with the ruler of nations, the poet, the scientist. The man in the pulpit is the last man to allow himself to be dubbed a "back number" and not compel his opponent to either swallow or make good the fling.

The present-day pulpit breathes the oxygen of two texts, "The faith which was once delivered to the saints," and "Into all the world." It is evermore moving out into the young day with the memories of the old day. And these memories are to achieve the mastery of the coming ages. There is more momentum at the call of the man in the pulpit than for any other man on earth. He holds more truth for instant use than belongs to any other profession. If any man should be in quick touch with the passing day he is the man in the pulpit. The two sides of his calling—according to Spener, substance and personality; according to Brooks, truth and personality—must be ever in mind. He is the holder of the past for the use of the present. If now, looking at the latter of these, he exalts movement above matter, he should remember that movement implies not only change, but continuity of life. Dead matter moves only when it is carried, and not for the reason which must be assigned for the triumph of the Church of God.

So the question of the "universal homiletic" depends upon the meaning of the two halves just named, truth and personality. If the eye is fastened upon the first, we get an affirmative; if upon the latter, a negative. The unprevailing gates of hell have tested the permanence of the Church of Jesus Christ. There have been at once unity and continuity of faith. "Certain fundamental ideas of the Gospel have never been lost, and have defied all attack." So says Harnack. In the emancipation of the human soul the chief agent from a human point of view is a changing yet continuous homiletic; not the protean witchery of the Greek myth, but the power of God unto salvation. Below all change is fundamental life. This is the stay of every unpracticed builder. All other considerations are of minor worth compared with this. This is the guarantee of our permanent embassy. The preacher is sent with a revelation. If there is to be any sort of an evolution it will be in the line of the better understanding of that revelation, and not in that of any substan-

tial additions thereto. Any so-called "preservative additions" will prove to be like the "fool's" gold with which the voyagers laded their vessels, only to be made the laughingstock of their fellows at home.

Yet a highly refined articulation of this revelation in creed form is not needed for triumph over error and sin. We have the strongest evidence that a short creed will be able to work out a loving life and a lasting reformation. The grip of the creed that is lessening in quality but growing in power is mightier in our day than ever before. In the effort, however, to throw aside confessional elaborations of faith as the basis of advance some may harm their cause. We are liable to have reproduced in the pulpit effects similar to those in art, wherein "impressionism" seeks the reproduction of scenery in its larger and less defined outlines; no more the twig and leaf, but the dim and distant view as it melts into the far-lying horizon. Some pulpits mistake the gloaming of sentiment for the glory of spiritual power. It may be that this is another way man has of straining for the true method, and that in the pulpit "impressionism" is a sort of declaration of independence against literal elaboration. In wise following of the Aristotelian "middle way" the pulpit will combine both spirit and letter. In one way we may portray God as unapproachable by syllogistic process, as the undeseried One who dwells in eternity; but, on the other hand, let us bring him into the very closest touch with the morose and wounded lives of the embittered all about us. It is plain that we are moving to a drumbeat in human progress which our fathers would have disowned, and that the present pulpit is more disposed to grant to each individual more rights of faith in details than formerly; but we shall not sigh for the restrictions of other days, in the shape of uniformity acts, to give us a surer hold upon the hearts of men. It is no just reproach against the preaching of the times that it allows much freedom to the private conscience in the matter of creed building. As to matters of faith, the compulsory swallowing of food, when the food offered is indigestible, is puerile in homiletics and untrue to human nature. The practice of a score of virtues is bound up with the belief in a mere handful of articles of faith. In ethics, many goods; in creed, few articles. A short creed will serve for a long life. Lake Itasca starts the Father

of Waters. In the flow of the mighty stream there are supplies for a million acres. The golden rule will do for the divine standard to measure off goods to clothe a hundred thousand waifs, and to insure just judgment between embittered nations whose hostile interests force them apart as do the waves of the restless seas that roll against both shores.

If John Wesley were living would he not chide us for mint, anise, and cummin homiletics? On the one hand, no one would deprecate a creedless Church with more emphasis than he. But the essential truths of the revelation of grace are not hard to find in the book—God manifest as a Trinity through the God-man and the mission of the Comforter; man taken out of sin and introduced into a state of holy living through the pardoning grace of the suffering Saviour; man made a colaborer with God in bringing about the consummation of the desires of the Son of God for an eternal kingdom of believers out of which shall be formed the new heaven of the Father's purpose.

The struggle between the old and the new will work out good in the end. The pulpit simply takes its share in the general movement. Here, as elsewhere, there is something to be dropped and something to be carried forward. There is also a foreshadowing of the truer thought and of the wiser evangelism of to-morrow, in the unwillingness to pinch the growing foot of the swifter herald of to-morrow in the tiny toy of a past day's pride in custom, tradition, or rule. Faith will have its increase, both in quality and quantity. If our movement is a vital one, and not a mechanical one, we shall without a shadow of doubt see more faith when the Son of man comes. For there is no power in which there is not also much of prophecy. Power is itself prophecy.

Only thus can we fairly represent the Master. The vitality of the pulpit is blood kin to its power of vision. Its three words are, "anchorage," "adaptation," "advance." As any circle can be drawn by means of three points, so the world may be included in these three. Harnack has a significant passage in his *History of Dogma*, in which he shows how the early Church planted itself on Christ, aimed for the whole world, and used the Græco-Roman world for its agent. "The Gospel became a world religion in that, having a message for all mankind, it preached it to Greek and Bar-

barian, and accordingly attached itself to the spiritual and political life of the wide Roman empire." In all this the anchorage is none the less firm, though the adaptation demands change; it may be confidently asserted that modification of statement is often a declaration of the mastery of essential principles. It may be said that error is an effort at adaptation. Yes; but error steals a little stock, and then waters it into manifold size. Not so with truth. The chameleon versatility of unbelief, that creeps with credulous eagerness upon each new substitute for the truth and absorbs the hue of every last guess at truth, serves to make plain that error becomes visible and attracts notice only as it fastens itself to some distorted or fractional discovery. One error gives way to another, to be in turn displaced. For instance, there are two kinds of fatalism, the Calvinistic and the scientific. They differ in this, that the former does not allow a man who is doomed to know his fate, while the latter oppresses him with the feeling that this is about all the knowledge he can claim. The old-time denial of free will has had its day, and another is passing. Until of late much emphasis has been put upon the scientific doctrine of heredity, and many have enlarged upon its gloomier phases. It is an important truth, but not all-explaining. Some who, as experts in penology, gave in their adherence to this gloomy fatalism, have of late renounced their former belief, and are now denouncing the pessimism that lurked in the doctrine they once advocated. In a late paper Mr. Round, Secretary of the National Prison Association, argued that criminals are not the victims of heredity. "I wish to put myself on record," he says, "after a study of the criminal, and contrary to my previous utterances, as going squarely back to the doctrines of free will as laid down by our fathers." Dr. Williams, of Randall's Island Hospitals, holds to the same view. Heredity is not the transmission of conditions so much as of tendencies, and environment has more to do with the formation of character than inheritance. So the latest science gives new force to the old faith, and we may confidently assert that no living appeal of the pulpit will be permanently poisoned by the mischievous notions of the foes of truth. The basis of the "universal homiletic" is divine.

When we address ourselves to the other side of our question

we find a tremendous burden of responsibility rolled upon the living pulpit. Not the least reason for this is that there is here no "universal homiletic." For the preacher must be first of all a witness. No sorcery, no charm of speech, no wealth of knowledge, can transform the man who is not a witness into a preacher of the Gospel. The wisdom must be both of the head and the heart. It is as true now as ever that the distinction of St. Augustine holds good between *sapientia* and *eloquentia*. *Sapientia* without *eloquentia* will do good; *eloquentia* without *sapientia* will do no good. In the union of the two there is the world-transforming pulpit. Induction never yet made a true preacher. Inspiration alone can do that.

Nor can we hope that the office will do for the man what nothing else on earth has ever done. Officialism and efficiency are not destined to the highest sort of union. Ordination papers are a poor substitute for the oracles of God. The man must be authorized, as well as his place. Yet even here there is peril. Hence the true witness is always loath to bolster up his sermons by a too ready reference to his own personal experience of the truth which is taking hold of the world. The emotion of the passing day is too small a mirror for the sun of truth. No one should be stripped of his well-grounded conviction of the power of his personality in the pulpit, but he should beware of making too frequent trips to that storehouse. It will give out before the truth which embraces the world. One's own life cannot be the standard of God's dealings with men. God is at work upon a world problem in which one man's life is a small fraction. The too frequent use of autobiographical material is apt to seduce a man from the hard study of the age-long purpose of the Redeemer. Autobiography errs in substituting the feeling of the day for the philosophy of the ages. The present day is not to set up the petty tyranny of the day over the truth of the centuries. God has a thousand ways of affecting men, and it is our duty to follow him out on the lengthening pathway trod by the saints of all ages. The man is not the first thing in the sermon. He is the first thing the sermon is to flow through in order to achieve its expected end. Corot's devotion to his art suggests a most important lesson: "Truth is the first thing in art, and the second, and the third." One may not tell the whole truth in one sermon, but what is

told must square with all other truth in the universe, so far as one may hold the two in equipoise. The imperative need is system in our thinking if ever the pulpit is to become the Moses of Red Sea crossings of the twentieth century, stretching a mighty wand over defiant waves and drying a way for the safe passage of even little children.

The true witness will not misuse his place of power. The practice of pulpit tricks and the violence of pulpit acrobatics suggest to all sane and devout souls the circus antics of a clown, and the church becomes a ring where song and sawdust are inextricably mixed. High duty is travestied, and the whistling strokes of rapier scorn justly circle the head of the man whose only halo is a fool's cap. If one man errs on the side of a strained originality, the man whose ambition is to duplicate a brother's splendid efforts turns the pulpit into a cage where the parrot reigns supreme. It is hard to decide upon the proper penalty for these two opposites, the parrot plagiarist and the clownish original. Men are not so much to blame for enduring a homiletic harness as when, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the clergy were compelled to abstain from their own sermonic efforts and to use those ordered by the rulers, all of which was contrary to the judgment of Archbishop Grindal, who was sequestered for his importunity; but when the preacher is himself the victim of his own conscious surrender to the homiletic helps on his shelves the case is pitiful indeed. The advance of the kingdom is not to illustrate the Master's willingness to give premiums to pulpits erected upon ready-made sermons. If in any man's library there be a volume that looks as if its title should be—no matter what it is—*Preaching Made Easy*, let him start for the encomium which the men of Ephesus won in Holy Writ for their brave firing of their old volumes of magical prescriptions, and add heat, if not light, by a kindred conflagration. It is to be feared that some without these various homiletic helps would be like the Ephesian wrestler who, lacking the incantation of the mystic scrap of parchment on his person, was worsted by his opponent. The recipe for pulpit power is not in homiletic confections. They are rather the sweet poison of pulpit giants. There is a definite increase of logical skill, of imaginative insight, of substantial exegesis, of wholesome sympathy for the flock, in a manly preference of



one's own second-rate skeleton to the first-rate one of the ablest preacher on earth. Imagine the good to come from a sermon upon "Thou shalt not steal," taken bodily from another's sermonic coop. Emerson's definition of a scholar, "man thinking," is yet more true of the real preacher. Some such motto should spur us to fresh effort, as that which on the walls of the old Winchester school in England fired the boys to their tasks: "*Aut disce, aut discede; manet sors tertia, caedi.*" The mind that turns to the world of action, of letters, that watches the tides of social life, that feeds the imagination and fashions according to living methods the message for the day, scorns with joy the fear that haunts the man whose path some braver pilgrim has had to "blaze." It is a woeful waste of hard-won cash to invest it in any sort of "homiletic helps." The mental independence which wastes no time in unshelving dusty illustrations is one with that originality which spurns the offer of an unchanging homiletic, with as much pride and far more sense than Johnson showed when he hurled from his door at Pembroke the shoes some friend had laid there for the indigent scholar.

Homiletic folly is never so absurd as when it cherishes the hope of discovering an absolute standard of homiletic art. From the standpoint of art the sermon is not a piece of sculpture, but a tool of might, with which men are sent of God to carve his name upon the forefront of the ages. The sermon is too much coupled with its time to attempt an absolute standard. There is both limitation and liberty in this. The very close contact of the poem and the sermon with their time is evidence of life. We are not to count this necessary "orientation" as weakness. The permanent vitality of the Gospel is the bride of each new age, arrayed in the evermore radiant garments of the bettered art of the last thought man gets of God's will and purpose. A real preacher of the Gospel cannot be content to seek that far-off absolutism of an artistic and unchanging form when his hearers are dying for lack of bread. The very power that seems flawless is a failure. Emerson's discovery of weakness in the "Iliad," because of the freedom with which Homer lays on the local colors and indulges in constant allusions to the petty things of his day, is hardly worthy of the name. The "localisms" of the poet, are they not the proof

that the crown of Grecian art was won when it refused to waste its vigor upon the misty generalities of the farther East? So the great pulpit thinkers have followed a goodly throng of giants in art when they have turned from the griefs of the Goths to the struggles of socialism. The power of God is the permanent thing. The power of the devil is the ever-vacillating thing. It is of small use to fire into the ranks of the Hittites, Perizzites, Amorites, or other available ancients, when the hypocrisy of sham, the pride of place, and the avarice of the saloon are joining hands to inaugurate a dominion of demagogues, while the *dilettante* patriotism of the day declines to rule save by the vicarious authority which each reeking caucus assumes only to profane.

We live in an age in which the poet and the preacher are united by a common sympathy against an unjust criticism. The scientific iconoclast has played the part of the highway-man against their peace. Huxley, in speaking of poetic expression, called it "sensual caterwauling," and Stedman justly calls him to account, and as a poet looks forward to the time when men shall not give attention to the analysis of tears, but shall endeavor to create them. The heart must have its food. Poetry and preaching are not to become obsolete influences in the scheme of progress. If the German poet be right in declaring that the last man is to be the last poet, then the last man is to test the uplifting power of two wings, one of them poetic and the other sermonic. If the seers who stand on tiptoe behold the day of reconciliation between the scientist and the poet, so may we, who have been classed down with the poet in a day of loss of power in which the analyst is the fore, behold our day rising in the new east of a better knowledge of the proper relations we sustain toward all the classes and all the masses of mankind. The world is far from being done with us. The very ship that bore the Indian sage, Dharmapala, back to India had on board a band of Christian missionaries. A great day is about to dawn. The hour is ringing its optimistic chimes. We are on the verge of vaster domains to be won to Christ than ever in the past. So our own Haven was convinced, and so Whittier sang:

The day is greating to the dawn ;  
The century's aloe flowers to-day.

Now are we able to see in what true originality consists. That pulpit which puts itself in the hand of God for the lifting of this dolorous time out of its selfishness into the finer service of the coming age is the original pulpit. It may be unable to point out the details of the new struggle or show the splendor of the new morning in all its freshness. What of that? It is none the less original. The sun that smiles over the sea cliffs of the east is none the less original because our fathers washed away the stains of their sleep in the mellow radiance of his beams. He is to us the new light of the new day, and as he climbs up the steep of the sky to stir the world to action he is as original as when he called Abraham to his tent door.

It is a small ambition that a man of God should be anxious to merely keep up with his time; let him rather go ahead of it in every good word and work. The fly on the axletree of the chariot, in *Æsop's* fable, saying, "What a dust do I raise," is too often the man content to share the unearned victory and to claim all the honors. Like the fly, such a man is too small to be thrown off; if he were heavier he would either fall to the roadside or go to the front. The great chariot of the Captain of our salvation is moving on with quickened speed; but it is a matter of regret that its velocity should become a test of the tenacity with which insect incumbrances hold on, with heads too small to be dizzied and with feet more used to adhesion than to progression. Not to hang on, but to hasten on, should be the aim. We must hasten. We have come too far not to go farther. Our power is not a meager revenue we get by taxing the glorious memories of the dead, but the capital of God's omnipotence which feeds with its compounding interest the hungry hosts of the unsaved. The real pulpit is not weakening. Its very limitations are an evidence of magnificent endowments and a surety of mightier triumphs. The philosopher's stone of the pulpit is not a "universal homiletic," but an ever-changing, Christlike charm of the adaptable message, in whose all-comprehensive service the travel-stained feet of pilgrims without number find washing and the pulseless forms of the dead find life.

Just now we are the witnesses of a phase of social unfolding that indicates the necessity of the adaptation of permanent principle to a new need. We are in the midst of a tidal move-

ment toward a fuller recognition of the corporate life of the human family. This is a comparatively new thing. There are several causes for this. The impersonal laws of the scientific realm, the new and combining efforts of the industrial world, the widening democracy of the political world, all tend to increase the sense of the mutual responsibility by which the world is being drawn together. The humblest reporter has a higher notion of the "people" than even Shakespeare could have had. His standard was concrete and individual, and he had no praise for the impersonal "many-headed monster." The one thing for the pulpit to grip firmly is the new idea that has forged to the front, and to show clearly that, as it has had the Gospel for the one man, so now it will not fail with a Gospel for the composite social estate that is rising up all about us. It is for us to offer an anticipatory attitude toward every new ill, that we be not caught napping, that we believe in the cure we proclaim. It is an ominous thing when men, stirred by an intense desire to know the truth, and knowing no anchorage save the effort that holds them to their daily task, turn away from the Christian pulpit and look to the ephemeral counterfeits of eternal verities for satisfaction. Not all the blame can be put upon the restless nonechurchgoing crowd, sadly prodigal of powers which, if they were trained in righteousness, would give the King his kingdom in a day. Are we in default? Is our culture a clog? May it not be a lever? Is our place to be trusted with scholarship? Are we ever inclined to trust to inheritance, and not to try achievement? Is not the pulpit set here to illustrate how much of a burden God can afford to put upon men's shoulders? It is the Atlas of all time, not bearing the great round burden as a penalty of angry deity, but as the honored colaborer of the loving God who would save men through men.

—We are in line with the utmost advance of the new day, as well as in touch with the certified principles of the Founder. We ought to make it plain that we know no poison for which we lack the antidote, no misery for which we lack an anodyne, no waning vigor for which we lack the tonic of life. Homiletic literature, at its best, very brightly mirrors the passing day. If the spirit of the age emphasizes the individual, the sermon notices this accent. It may even be drawn to excess in

its accent of the prevalent idea. Only vigilance will enable it to hold a firm course between the rock and the whirlpool. But it should not allow the new need to run too far in advance of the supply it alone is able to offer. It has been said that there has been a threefold issue of dogma as represented in Romanism and in Socinianism and in Protestantism. May we not add another, about to take shape due to the efforts of the great blind giant men call Socialism, which struggles to get the race a little further on its way? Can it be that the prospects held out before men by street-corner oracles are utterly without recognition in the basal attitude of the Gospel toward the future of society?

We must admit two things, first, that Jesus has exhausted the idea of a perfect religion; second, that the future is needed to bring its accumulations of effort to be measured by the Carpenter's rule. His very vastness of comprehension of plan precludes the possibility of our seeing clearly with our fathers' eyes; in order to see Jesus our own eyesight must grow hourly keener. For he rises to new levels with the evolution of each new age. Jesus is first revelation—we should say, *was* first—then he was redemption, then regeneration; we now see him in his latest manifestation of might as the regulator of society. No homiletic can hold the ages to their various destinies without the kaleidoscopic personality of Jesus Christ. The ability to propagate truth comes from him. He prefers the life of an enthusiasm that has blemishes to the deadness of a restraint that is flawless. Men will be led to say with Arndt, "When I am thirsty I prefer a troubled spring to a dry well." The *abandon* of a courteous, courageous, scholarly pulpit is the "desire of the nations." Such a pulpit need have no fear that the power of the Lord of the world will become less through effort to cover vaster territory. A constant inspiration lies in the feeling that all progress is permanent which has Jesus for its monumental file-leader. It is as Freemantle has said, "When the Church is seen to be the constant inspirer of human progress there will be no skeptics but those to whom human progress is indifferent." When it comes to pass that worship shall go with Christ to the house of God to hear him read the lessons; and the family shall repeat the scenes of the Nazareth home; and knowledge shall learn of the great Teacher, and art ask how

the Carpenter in the little shop of the hill town toiled ; and trade be not compelled to absent itself from the Lord's table because it has the money of the land ; and society shall have no feast to which the chief Guest is not invited ; and statesmanship shall make no war without the Captain ; and philanthropy shall break no bread till it has his benediction ; and the pulpit shall ignore its commission and doubt its inspiration unless from him—then it may be known that the King has come to his kingdom.

Let but the pulpit covet a passion for reality in preaching the Saviour akin to that possessed by Holman Hunt in his paintings. Ruskin has a significant contrast between Rossetti and Hunt :

To Rossetti the Old and New Testaments were only the greatest poems he knew ; and he painted scenes from them with no more actual belief in their relation to the present life and business of men than he gave to the "Morte d'Arthur" and the "Vita Nuova." But to Holman Hunt the story of the New Testament, when once his mind entirely fastened on it, became what it was to an old Puritan, or an old Catholic of true blood—not merely a reality, not merely the greatest of realities, but the only reality. So that there is nothing in the earth any more that does not speak of that, there is no course of thought nor force nor skill for him but it springs from and ends in that.

Shall the perishable canvas tell to few generations the tale of such devotion, and shall the preacher fritter his time away in the passionless pastime of giving pleasure to a select few, when he might be fashioning a vast volume of "living epistles?"

The world is to be saved by preaching. A mere matter-of-fact obedience to the divine call has its fair reward. But there is a richer quittance in store for the man who, out of his partial successes and painful failures, out of mingled fears and hopes, out of the tremulous utterances of tremendous truths, has learned to count his place of power far beyond his deserts, and to rejoice that the largest accumulations of knowledge, the severest training, the most sinewy skill, can never be hampered by the size of the position he is striving to fill. If the young preacher be a true man, the sense of the worth of the few square feet set apart for him in front of his fellows, the feeling that here is no common bush but one "afame with God," and which he dare not approach with sandaled feet—this sense can never grow dull with the passing years, and he afterward



comes to chide himself, when amid new marvels and sterner struggles to achieve his ideal, that his early wonder had no wider horizon. He who does not find his conception of the pulpit growing as the other influential factors grow, and outgrowing them, may well be alarmed.

Preaching—a man's standing before men, and by force of mind and grace of address and heat of soul trying to put God's thought into their lives—this shall have evermore its own crown as chief among the princes of progress. Neither familiar acquaintance nor furious antagonism can ever diminish the colossal size of the pulpit. Here the rarest souls win rarest triumphs. He who clings to the surpassing value of his calling, and with the true preacher's double passion—now for truth and now for souls—never fails to scan new skies, and to try untrod paths, and to answer the freshest challenges of his foes with more than their daring—he will know no “dead line” save the one in the city of the dead. Of such men may say, as was said of Moses, “No man knoweth of his sepulcher.” Of others—well, no matter.

The pulpit is a chariot, not a hearse. What a difference between the man who, a few years ago, left the pulpit for the stage, and the man, now dead a hundred years, who hewed his desk of stone with the same hands that wrought the immortal *Checks*, and found his dying couch transformed into a flaming phaeton such as even the heat of the pagan poet's frenzy never fashioned for the madcap of the mythic sky! Miln thought to find in the drama an educator more engaging, more wise, and more enduring than could be secured in the Christian pulpit. Fletcher cried out with failing breath: “Shout! Shout aloud! I want a gust of praise to go to the ends of the earth!” Who knows of the preacher-actor? Who has forgotten the preacher-seraph?

R. G. Stevenson

ART. VII.—THE ATMOSPHERE AND THE PERSONNEL  
OF OXFORD UNIVERSITY.

IF one has a real love for English literature, or for English Church history, he must also have an appetite more or less developed for Oxford. We say less, as well as more, developed, because there are many men of true literary instincts whose longings for Oxford are not at all pronounced. But, if these were once, by chance, to drink at this fountain head, their whole soul would cry out with unwonted delight.

The true university is before all things a vast conservatorium, a treasure-house of human achievements already wrought. It is a broad, lofty platform reared upon the unshaken pillars of established truths, where the laborers of to-day may accurately lay down their base lines, and from which they may confidently project their angles, deducing legitimate conclusions concerning the things not known from the things which do appear. Such a university is Oxford, rich in its historic traditions, which are as old as the English people, rich in its endowments of books and buildings, and ever rich in its cultured society of earnest scholars.

It is difficult to write with any degree of satisfaction about Oxford, it is so large, so varied, and so unique. If one can imagine a score or more of Wesleyan universities or Princetons all clustered together in convenient proximity, in the center of a city of fifty-five or sixty thousand inhabitants, he may get some idea of its size. Then, if he can imagine that each of these several groups of college buildings bears a marked individuality or style of its own, including kitchens, dining halls, dormitories, libraries, chapels, museums, observatories, conservatories, laboratories, churches, a great publishing concern, and an ancient cathedral, he may get some idea of its variety. As for uniqueness, Oxford is purely unique; there is none other of its kind. Cambridge is entirely different, though in its way quite as interesting, both in history and spirit. In the minds of those who are acquainted with Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown* there already exists a picture of Oxford. A truer portrayal of that famous seat will never be made; and who wishes anything modern to surpass the Oxford of fifty years ago?

Instead of "going up" from Paddington in a Great Western express train—time one hour and twenty-five minutes—and "getting down" in one of the most dismal stations on the "line," whence one has to elbow his way through one of those everlasting English underground passages before he is privileged to set eyes on the most unsightly part of the city, let us leave London on top of an old-time stagecoach, behind four nervous, well-groomed cobs, and take the whole of a long October day to cover our sixty-odd miles. Thank fortune, one can still reach Oxford either from Warwickshire or London in the same respectable fashion that was good enough for Samuel Johnson and Thomas De Quincey, Joseph Addison and Jonathan Swift. Let no one persuade himself that he has ever seen England at her best until he has viewed her rural shires from something better than a car window. But here we are rounding Shotover Hill, and behold what a valley spreads out before us! It is the upper Thames, where the river Cherwell joins it. And there in the vale between the rivers, anciently accessible only by those fords from which it has taken its name, lies Oxford, "that lovely city with dreaming spires." Just before entering the town we pass the Cowley Cricket Grounds and Christ Church Tennis Fields, and now we roll over Magdalen Bridge and enter what to us, with the exception, perhaps, of High Street, Edinburgh, is the most interesting street in Europe. Sir Walter Scott said even more of it in his day, and Mr. Ruskin says as much of it now; and that ought to settle it. Hear him: "The stream-like winding of 'the High,' with its magnificent vista of Queen's, University, and All Souls' Colleges, and the churches of St. Mary the Virgin and All Saints, combine to form an architectural *tout ensemble* surpassed by no other city or town in the world."

Just before reaching the center of the city we pull up at the "Mitre," the most famous hostelry of middle England. It is a well-preserved old-time English inn, with all the traditions and aroma of the best Oxford life during the past five hundred years, and it is not superannuated yet. During the past summer it was rumored that an American capitalist had purchased the "Mitre," with the intention of replacing it with a modern hotel on the American plan; but, thanks to the good sense and pride of the community, such a piece of high-handed vandalism

has not yet taken place. It is bad enough to have "the Crown Inn," so intimately connected with the visits of Shakespeare and the early days of Sir William Davenant, give place to the greed of a modern banking company; but as long as the "Mitre" can so comfortably shelter and provide for its guests palsied be the hand that removes her time-beaten tiles.

For him "who in the love of nature holds communion with her visible forms" it were difficult to imagine more inspiring haunts than those to be found in the gardens and by the lake of old Worcester College; or among the water walks and deer parks of Magdalen; or in the almost endless mazes, called "Mesopotamia," of the university gardens along the Cherwell; or on the broad city commons stretching away as far as Wolvercote on the upper Thames; or in Merton Fields, and Christ Church Meadows, and Bagley Wood, and all the other woods and fields and meadows that lie along the Isis, as the Thames is classically called below the city, as far as Abingdon. And one will certainly want to climb Shotover again, and read on its brow the legend of its naming; and some day climb to Cunmor Hurst, on the opposite side of the valley, and read Matthew Arnold's "Scholar Gypsy" beneath Arnold's "signal elm;" and make a detour, on his return, through Cunmor village, and read the epitaphs in Cunmor churchyard and in the church, together with a few verses from the chained Bible there—a copy, by the way, of the first edition of King James, and the basis of the English text of the celebrated Oxford Bibles ever since. And he will, of course, sentimentally study the Latin tablet to virtuous Anthony Foster, and wish there were a monument half so well done to poor Amy Robshart, who often worshipped here. And, if he has learned the stiles and gates and paths through the fields, he will come back to town by way of Abingdon Abbey and Godstow Abbey, in the former of which Amy Robshart, and in the latter of which "Fair Rosamund," were once girl graduates. Then there is Ifley for another afternoon's stroll, with its quaint and indescribably pretty little Norman church and its ancient yew trees; and there is Littlemore, a mile or so farther on, with its living monuments of John Henry Newman's "years in retreat;" and there is Dorchester, with its cathedral ruins, dating back to the time of Saint Birinus, the second great missionary bishop to

Britain, who followed Augustine of Canterbury after an interval of only forty years. And there is South Leigh, where John Wesley began his preaching as an Anglican deacon in a beautiful parish church which contains some of the rarest mural painting in all England. One can also visit the Castle Prison in Oxford and the lodgings in New Inn Hall Street, where the great itinerant began his preaching as a Methodist. Then there is a holiday drive out to Woodstock, for a view of the lodgings and the landscapes of Geoffrey Chaucer and the marvels within and around Marlborough House, where Henry II and Henry III and King John held court; and if the driver of the "trap" favors the plot, as he surely will for an extra sixpence, he may take in good King Alfred's boyhood home at Wantage, and give us a glimpse of the White Horse Vale, and bring us back through rose-embowered Marston, where Fairfax brought the king's commissioners to terms for Cromwell. By this time, if one is not ready to exclaim, with Nathaniel Hawthorne, that "it is a despair to see such a place and ever to leave it," he does not deserve an introduction to the librarian of the beautiful Bodleian, nor the privilege of knowing any of the inner delights of this wonderful city of colleges.

But let us pay a visit to Christ Church, which is the name of perhaps the leading college and of the cathedral of Oxford. We will enter by Canterbury gate from Bear Lane, just opposite Oriel College, whose common room has been so intimately connected with the academic discussions of Sir Walter Raleigh, Bishop Butler, John Keble, Dr. Arnold, Bishop Wilberforce, Archbishop Whately, Dr. Pusey, John Henry Newman, and Thomas Hughes. Passing under the lofty arch supported on either side by fluted Doric columns, we are in "Canterbury Quad," after the old Canterbury College which stood here, founded by Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1365. John Wyclif, at that time fellow of Merton College, was made first warden or president of Canterbury. In the open space behind his college, now marked by a fountain and the very center of the great "Tom Quad" of Christ Church, Wyclif began his open-air preaching, and from thence sent forth his itinerant Lollards, forerunners both of the English Reformation and of Methodism. Geoffrey Chaucer studied at Canterbury, and doubtless found in the great warden his true ideal of the priest of God.

Sir Thomas More was another great mind educated here, and when he left Canterbury College to take office at the court it was with the stipulation that he should first look to God and after that to the king. About a century and a half after its founding Canterbury College developed under the ambitious lead of Cardinal Wolsey into the foremost school of Oxford, being renamed first for Wolsey himself, and, after his disgrace and death, for his royal master, Henry VIII. It was not until 1546 that it finally received its present title, since which time, as before, many of the most eminent names in English history have been associated with it. To those who have not reached the time when they are no longer susceptible to such things there is exquisite pleasure in walking the courts and climbing the staircases and knowing the lodgings and lecture rooms, the grand library and chapel, and dining hall and buttery, where Wellington and Robert Peel and Philip Sidney and John Locke and William Penn and Ben Jonson and Dr. South and Francis Atterbury and Peter Martyr and the Wesleys and the Puseys and Gladstone and Ruskin and Liddell and Liddon and a host of others have taken their first steps toward greatness.

The Hall, as the college dining room is called, has the name of being the finest refectory in all beef-loving England. Its grand mediæval windows, its lofty oak-ribbed ceiling with pendant armorial bearings, its capacious fireplaces, its broad black old tables for undergraduates stretched along either side, and the table for the dons and dignitaries on a platform across the upper end; its four walls adorned with the portraits of its distinguished foundationers from the hands of such masters as Van Dyke, Hogarth, Reynolds, Gainsborough, Kneller, Holbein, and Millais—all these are a liberal education in themselves. Here Charles I assembled those members of his Parliament who remained faithful to him in his extremity, and here maintained his forlorn court during that historic winter of the royalists in Oxford. Henry VIII was banqueted here when head of the college, and here Elizabeth came from Woodstock to witness her earliest plays. Descending the grand stairway beneath Wolsey's Tower, remarkable for its roof of fan tracery, we enter the cloisters on the right side of the cathedral and reach the ancient chapter house. This room has



recently been restored, and, what with steam heating and comfortable red hangings covering a portion of the bare walls, is now the most popular lecture room in the college. One cannot help remarking the novelty of his situation as he sits quietly observing his surroundings, while a fully robed and bonneted canon calls the roll of his variously gowned divinity class. And one may, perhaps, be pardoned if he indulges the hope, while he nibbles his quill, that he may be sitting among the Wesleys of the twentieth century. The cathedral is a beautiful pile in mixed Norman and early English architecture, though dating back to Saxon times. It has the most ancient spire in England.

But to a nonchurchman the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, in High Street, is far more interesting than Christ Church Cathedral. St. Mary's is the university church. Its main entrance is through an attractive porch of the Italian style. During the days of the Puritan supremacy its twisted columns, together with the Virgin Mary, with Jesus in her arms holding a crucifix, were the subject of much criticism; and at the trial of Archbishop Laud the building of this porch formed one of the chief grounds of his impeachment. It was in St. Mary's that Cranmer, when brought to proclaim his adhesion to the Roman Church on the morning of his martyrdom, October 16, 1556, boldly repudiated all he had before said in favor of "Romish assumptions as contrary to the truth." It was but a few paces from the sanctuary to the stake, from the temple of God to the ditch without the city gates, where Latimer and Ridley had suffered but a few months before; and there did Cranmer "light such a candle by God's grace, in England, as shall never be put out." It has often been said that Cambridge educated and Oxford burned the martyrs, but it cannot be shown that Oxford University as such exerted any particular influence in this great tragedy. The commissioners of inquiry were chosen by the Convocation of Canterbury, and included, among others, the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, while the trial of the martyrs was conducted by Pole and the pope irrespective of either university. The pulpit of St. Mary's has been the pivot on which English Church history has turned since Wyclif's time. Catholic, Puritan, Anglican, Ritualist, Methodist, Tractarian, Most Reverend, Very Reverend, Reverend, and only

“rather” Reverend have thundered their doctrines, opinions, interpretations, expositions, impositions, excommunications, and anathemas above her sacred cushion; and, strange as it may appear, the Church of Christ our Lord still lives. Nevertheless, no more orthodox, or evangelical, or practical sermons have ever been preached there than those of the Bampton Lectureship, during the winter and spring terms of 1890, by the venerable Archdeacon Watkins, on the Johannean authorship of the fourth gospel.

But the crowning utterance of that year, and of the past decade, in St. Mary's was the last sermon of the now sainted Liddon, preached on Whitsunday. The great canon was always greatest in Oxford. Here he was educated; here he held a professorship in New Testament Greek for years; here his best sermons had been preached; here he held his lodgings as a resident fellow of Christ Church until death. For seven years he had not been heard in St. Mary's. He was out of all sympathy with the too progressive, or liberal, wing of his own High Church party. But he seemed to feel that before he died he ought to raise his voice in no uncertain manner against it. At London his message had already been delivered. For the last time the great dome of St. Paul's had reverberated with those silvery, searching tones. It was a beautiful Sabbath morning, the most beautiful of that entire summer term. We were told by Canon Paget, now Dean of Christ Church, then one of the regius professors, that the old university church had not been so crowded in a generation. At precisely half past ten the beadles, bearing their huge gold and silver maces, began the procession from the side chapel down the nave. They were followed by Dr. Bellamy, the vice chancellor, with Canon Liddon on his left. At the top of the aisle Dr. Bellamy made a respectful bow of dismissal, and the preacher of the day ascended the high pulpit. The gowned and hooded line advanced to its stalls—doctors, proctors, masters, wardens, and heads of houses. All pray in silence; all sing in solemn harmony; all stand in reverence, while the Bidding Prayer is read, and devoutly kneeling join in the prayer of our Lord. Then the text is announced, and England's greatest preacher of the present generation is at home again—“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he

will guide you into all truth." The theme was the "Inspiration of Selection." The sermon was a discussion of the Holy Spirit's influence, (1) in the guidance and work of the apostles; (2) in the foundation and conquests of the early Church; and (3) in the inspiration, selection, and preservation of the sacred canon. It was fervent, cumulative, and convincing. The main force was given to the last head, in which the inspiration, selection, and preservation of the canon of Holy Scripture was boldly proclaimed. Unhallowed criticism was rebuked, irreverent liberalism was silenced, and the great throng, with moistened eyes and glowing hearts, again and again thanked God that their Daniel had come to judgment. We left St. Mary's that morning, as we had often left it before, convinced that still "the foundation of God standeth sure," and that Liddon would live when *Lux Mundi* should have been long forgotten.

Oxford does not any longer belong to the English Church, nor to the English nation alone, but to all English people; and to charge one born with a bias for Oxford with the affection vulgarly called "Anglophobia" is about as childish as to pronounce a man a rationalist because he has been to Berlin. Everything in Oxford is open to the serious seeker, except the two degrees in divinity; but all the honor of the work for these is freely granted, and that is all that any serious scholar wants. When once the somewhat terrifying, but exceedingly harmless and wholesome, barrier of red tape has been passed, one finds himself in the midst of surroundings the only embarrassment of which is their delightful cordiality. To receive repeated calls, and those not in the least formal, from the professor whom you esteem to be the most Christian and scholarly gentleman in the university, and whom you know to be the most indefatigable worker; to be given a special appointment; and then to be met and conducted about and introduced to men and things by another of the most revered and lovable of Oxford's professors, who tells you between times of his pet notions regarding the East Indian tongues—of some of which he is the only living English master—with the enthusiasm and clearness of a true instructor, and who insists upon hearing your opinions, if indeed you can command any in such a presence, and inquires about America with the genuine interest and sympathy

of a father; to receive marked social favors where you had supposed the most artificial exclusion prevailed—these are some of the things that deepen one's sense of obligation and of respectful attachment to what he considers to be the leading center of English life and letters.

Permit us to sketch a scene or two in outline, portraying a pair of lecturers who but three years since easily stood chief among Oxford's list of princely instructors, and both of whom to-day are numbered with the great majority. Here is Benjamin Jowett, as he lectures on Plato—a fresh, ruddy gentleman well past seventy, full but not stout; with beautiful white hair, clean shaven face, and the most cultivated voice and manners; simply and dispassionately talking on, with the utmost ease and deliberation, about the Greek philosopher and what he said and thought and meant. Our lecturer is the honored master of Balliol College, and has been for generations, and while he speaks he frequently looks through the half-opened window into the college garden and seems unconsciously to imbibe a sweetness and calmness that well-kept gardens always appear to have for philosophers. We are sure that garden, and everything, in fact, about Balliol, liked to have Jowett look upon it, because Jowett was a gentleman and a scholar. When the hour is half done a servant quietly brings in a cup of tea and a bit of bread and butter for the master; and when the servant retires and bears away the empty tray he seems as proud, if possible, as the garden.

Here is Professor Edward Augustus Freeman, as he lectures on the "Rise of the European States." He is a short, thick-set man, who has well-nigh reached his threescore and ten, with a big and reddish beard. He appears to be suffering from chronic asthma, which trouble makes it difficult for both lecturer and audience, especially as he tries to read rapidly from manuscript what you wish he would give, in substance, extempore and more slowly. His appearance impresses one as a little grotesque, for he always wears his black academic cap and gown above a suit of gray a little too well worn. When we saw him bearing down the street for his lecture room he invariably reminded us of a retired and scantily pensioned sea captain.

But to the present reader no names shine forth in the entire

list of Oxford worthies so illustriously as those of John and Charles Wesley, felicitously called "the head and the heart of Methodism." For the last three hundred years the name of Wesley has probably been inscribed upon the roster rolls of Oxford University as continuously as that of any other English family. Bartholomew, the great-grandfather of the Wesleys; John, their grandfather; Samuel, their father, and Samuel, Jr., their elder brother, as well as Dr. Samuel Annesley, their maternal grandfather, had all preceded them as holders of advanced degrees in the great school, and, without exception, had gone forth as able divines in the Church of Jesus Christ. Bartholomew was skilled in medicine as well as in theology, and it is said that his great-grandson, John, inherited his medical tendencies from this source. John, the next in the line, was profoundly learned in the oriental languages, and was the first of the Wesleys to develop a marked talent for keeping a daily journal in which he described all the events of his outward life, as well as the workings of his heart. Samuel, the son of this John and father of the greater John to follow, was a member of Exeter College. It was in him first that the poetic gifts of the house showed themselves. One of his poems, written immediately after the battle of Blenheim, so pleased the first Duke of Marlborough that he made its author chaplain of one of his chief regiments, and promised him a prebend, which last was foiled by controversial disputes with the Dissenters, who were then very powerful in Parliament. This same gifted Samuel wrote an elaborate Latin commentary on the Book of Job, and projected a polyglot edition of the Bible in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, and Latin, and with the help of his son John, then in Oxford, finished a considerable portion of it, as we find in his letters, though we are unable to say whether he ever actually carried any of it through the press. The three famous sons of Samuel Wesley, namely, Samuel, Jr., John, and Charles, succeeded one another in the order named as members of Christ Church College, the first being entered in 1711, the second in 1720, and the third in 1726.

It was during this period, or perhaps, more broadly speaking, during the entire first half of the eighteenth century, that the University of Oxford, when measured by the ideal standard of a great Christian school, sounded the lowest depths of her

history; and it is most instructive to note, as one of Wesley's biographers has already done, that the greatest evangelical movement of modern times "took its rise in the attempt made by an Oxford tutor to bring back to the national institution for education something of that method which was at this time so disgracefully neglected." The condition of morals throughout Great Britain was deplorable. The utmost licentiousness prevailed at court, and the vices of the first two Georges had a baleful effect upon the nation. Political honesty was a thing unknown among parliamentary leaders. It is sober history that even the most eminent men had their price, and that those in power maintained themselves there by well-placed bribery. The leisure classes delighted in drunkenness and debauchery, and gloried in their shame. Infidelity ran rampant, and those writers were most popular who adopted a style in accord with the debased and coarse tastes of the day. Among the people generally the same flagrant immorality prevailed. The streets were continually disturbed by riots. The public-house signs offered to make men drunk for a penny, and dead drunk for twopence, with straw to lie upon! In the rural districts real barbarism reigned, and in the mining counties brutal savagery. There was darkness in high places and darkness in low places; darkness in the court, the camp, the Parliament, and the bar; darkness in country and in town; darkness among the rich and among the poor; a gross, thick religious and moral darkness; a darkness that might be felt. Nor was the Church much better. Says one of the least impassioned of Wesleyan historians:

The fires of martyrdom destroyed the early leaders of the English Reformation. The imperial will of Elizabeth made the Anglican Church subject to state tutelage. The agents employed to carry on the work were both impious and ignorant, and so the work of reformation lacked both efficiency and spirituality. The Puritans for a while blew a clear blast from the Bible trumpet, but political bias and statecraft damaged the spiritual character of their work, and they sank down into a condition very little better than that of the Establishment itself.

Such was the condition of both Church and country at the time when Mr. John Wesley, Fellow and Moderator of Lincoln College; Mr. Charles Wesley, King's Scholar and Student of Christ Church College; Mr. William Morgan, Commoner



of Christ Church College; Mr. Robert Kirkham, Member of Merton College; Mr. Benjamin Ingham, of Queen's College; Mr. Thomas Broughton, of Exeter College; Mr. John Clayton, of Brasenose College; Mr. Charles Kinchin, Fellow of Corpus Christi College; and Mr. John Gambold, of Christ Church College, set seriously before themselves the task of seeking and practicing personal holiness. Although the name of the elder Wesley is usually mentioned first in a list of the Oxford reformers, it must always be borne in mind that to Mr. Charles Wesley the opprobrious term of "Methodist" was in reality first applied, and that the epithet "The Holy Club" was first derisively given to the little gatherings of twos and threes for religious inquiry in the apartments of the same classical gentleman. It may be also interesting here to recall the fact that the "strangely warm" feeling which John experienced in Aldersgate Street, London, on the evening of Wednesday, May 24, 1738, had already been enjoyed by his younger brother, Charles, for an entire week.

Of all the attractive corners in all the classic wynds and cloistered quadrangles of Oxford there is none which compares in interest with the lodgings which Mr. John Wesley, Master of Arts, occupied as fellow of Lincoln College—for it was in those lodgings, and during that occupancy, that an Oxford movement was born the momentum of which is destined to accelerate as the square of the distance therefrom increases; and if Oxford is anything in the sight of Almighty God, she is such as the mother of moral movements, and of such movements beyond question the chief is that of Methodism. Let us visit Lincoln College, and especially the apartments of Lincoln's leading don. Turning out of Turl Street, right next to Exeter and opposite to Jesus College, we enter a venerable tower gateway, with groined roof, and stand within the first quadrangle, which was founded in 1427 by Richard Flemyng, Bishop of Lincoln—the shire, by the way, to which Epworth belongs, and in which John and Charles Wesley were born. On our left is the hall, the exterior of which remains nearly in its pristine state; the interior was remodeled in 1701, two years before John Wesley was born. Here the members of the college dined with the dons and doctors at the upper end, and the commoners at the long tables extending down the room. Here,

also, Mr. Wesley conducted the daily discussions at which he presided as moderator. Next to the hall in interest comes the chapel, which is one of the rarest relics in Oxford. It is wainscoted with cedar, and the heavy roof and screen are of the same wood. The seats are surmounted by carved figures of the apostles, said to be the work of Grinling Gibbons. In the windows there is some remarkable stained glass, brought from Italy, and held to be at least five hundred years old. The east window, at the end of the nave, is particularly fine, being an allegorical composition in which Old Testament incidents are placed alongside their New Testament antitypes—as, for instance, the temptation of Eve, and that of our Lord; or the brazen serpent lifted upon the pole, and Christ raised upon the cross. In the inner quadrangle is a luxuriant grapevine, said to be cultivated in consequence of the heart of Bishop Rotherham having been so touched by a sermon of Dr. Trisloppe, the rector, from the text, "Behold, and visit this vine," that he was moved to build the second quadrangle. As this same vine clammers the wall and clusters about the windows of Wesley's lodgings, it is usually called by the enterprising porter when showing Americans about the college, "John Wesley's vine." Entering a narrow passage to the right, we ascend a flight of stairs to the second story and, on opening the door at the top, step at once into a plain room about sixteen feet square, the sanctum of the saints of the Holy Club. A small sleeping apartment opens off of one corner, and here the father of Methodism saw many an apocalyptic vision and dreamed many a prophetic dream. This is the spot where gathered, and whence issued, that devoted band of Oxford itinerants whose highly cultivated minds and deeply stirred hearts were the real source of the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century.

But a closing word about the recent movement toward making Oxford's influence more widely felt among the English people. This movement began in 1877, with the abolition of all churchly tests of membership in the university, and the opening of all degrees except those in divinity to nonconformists. Conservative Oxford had scarcely recovered from this wanton proceeding on the part of a liberal Parliament when the so-called "University Extension Scheme" was formed and put into successful execution, a plan which threw open her

priceless treasures to hundreds of ambitious and worthy provincials during the summer months. To think of Professor Max Muller making the inaugural address at such a meeting, and of many of the best lecturers and readers in the university gladly giving their services toward its success! It is a veritable Oxford Chautauqua. Then came the lifting of the latch to woman and her successful wrangling, as at Cambridge, with the best college men; for Oxford is not behind her sister school in this respect, though the fact has not been quite so widely advertised.

But, more important, if possible, than any of the foregoing facts is the very recent founding in Oxford of two distinctively nonconformist institutions, Mansfield College and Manchester New College. These represent respectively the extreme wings of English nonconformity; the one is the leading college, or, more properly speaking, theological school of the Congregationalists, and the other that of the Unitarians. Mansfield is already one of the finest college properties in this famous city of famous colleges. After many years of honorable history in the neighborhood of Birmingham the faculty and students removed to their beautiful foundation in Oxford only five years ago. This was indeed pushing the battle to the very gates, and it was one of the wisest moves the Independents have made in England during the past century. Dr. Fairbairn, who is widely known in America, is at the head of the faculty, and his school has already attracted the attention and admiration of all Oxford. Canon Ince, in his course of divinity lectures which we had the pleasure of taking in Christ Church, was constrained to speak in the highest terms of the quality of the work performed in Mansfield, frankly admitting that its standard was above that required of the theological candidate in the university—a fact which is beyond question. Dr. Broderick, Warden of Merton College, in his lectures on the "Place of Oxford University in English History," paid Mansfield an equally high tribute, and quoted her success to point an instructive moral for the grand old university to which he has given the best years of his life. Manchester New College was also just being removed to Oxford, having completed its first year in residence in temporary rooms rented in High Street. But it is now firmly rooted and well manned, with Dr. Drummond and

the Rev. F. E. Carpenter on its learned board of instruction. At its first commencement Rev. Brooke Hereford, of Boston, Mass., delivered the address welcoming the graduating class into the Unitarian ministry. He called upon all to give thanks to God that it had become possible for the free churches of England—nonconformists of nonconformists as they were, in the rejection of every demand for subscription to articles of faith—to establish at Oxford their college for students for the Christian ministry. Here, within the precincts of this great university, every intellectual and spiritual factor of the age was alive—keenly, eagerly, passionately alive. Here, therefore, was a training ground for the large-mindedness and large-heartedness which in this college were esteemed as of far more worth than any particular opinion that might be adopted by the students. They were charged not to look upon liberal Christianity merely as a collection of doctrines more or less heretical, but as a religion by which this passionately sectarian world might be redeemed from its sins.

What Methodist could listen to such things unmoved, or behold what glorious beginnings Mansfield had made, without feeling his heart strangely warmed? And what nobler monument could the great Wesleyan body raise to the memory of their founders than there in Oxford to establish a strong and living school for the maintenance of the faith once delivered to the saints?

*Chas. Sitterly*

## ART. VIII.—HELEN HUNT JACKSON.

THE genius and work of Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson are of such quality as to place her among the best of America's literary workers. She wrote poetry of the purest order, and was a most attractive writer of clear-veined prose fiction. Emerson, in some respects the finest soul of American literature, in the preface to his anthology, said: "The poems of Helen Hunt have rare merit of thought and expression, and will reward the reader for the careful attention which they require." Thomas Wentworth Higginson marks her higher than Augusta Webster, Jean Ingelow, or Christina Rossetti, saying: "Her poems are stronger than any written by women since Mrs. Browning, with the single exception of Mrs. Lewes. . . . Mrs. Jackson soars to your estimate loftily as a bird." Dr. A. B. Hyde, of Denver, says: "My estimate of Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson, both as poet and person, has increased with longer attention, and I believe that even if slightly crowded from view by the throng of good, not better, poets, she will not fail of good and abiding repute in our literature." It is certain that hers was a rare intellectual genius, holding a choice place among prose and poetic writers because of the fresh originality of her conceptions and the power with which she wrought her ideals into form.

The life and beautiful scenery of Colorado have been given by her pen a lasting place in the world of art, yet she put but little of the descriptive quality into her creations. Her poetry mostly occupies a different realm, telling usually of feeling, and thinking, and being. She runs the entire gamut of human emotion, from the wildest ecstasy of joy to the deepest and bitterest sorrow. She is a diviner of the tenderest, most sacred impulses which throb and burn and long for expression.

She has been written of as a brilliant, dashing woman of the world, who had traveled in many lands and was familiar with the manners and customs of many peoples; as one who had a passionate fondness for the wild flowers that bloom in special beauty in the fastnesses of mountains; as a fearless and graceful rider, at home in the saddle, happy with the wind in her hair and the healthy blood in her face. She was also the embodi-

ment of social charm. Her refined manner, her ready wit, her literary culture, enabled her to meet the demands of society life, and she had the tact to become the friend of the privileged as well as a sympathizer with the disadvantaged and distressed.

The effusions of her mind and the tracings of her pen plainly indicate the experiences of her heart. It is almost always so with literature which has power and charm. J. Howard Payne never had a home. It resulted in what? In those precious words from the opera which have sung themselves into the whole world's heart:

'Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam,  
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.

Harriet Beecher Stowe needed not the name of her gifted husband, nor that of her illustrious brother, or still wiser father, to give immortal luster to her name. Her own soul's passion vibrated through the world's heart, voicing the cry of the bondsman, calling loudly to his brethren who loved liberty. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did more than any other one thing to smite slavery with its deathblow. In Mrs. Stowe God gave the negro just the friend he needed then. So, too, the red man of America, driven back, oppressed, and almost destroyed, needed a champion, and Helen Hunt Jackson became the pleader for his cause, throwing the whole might of her influence in his favor until her appeal was heard in every part of this great commonwealth. She entered mind and heart into the "Indian question," and the Indians found in her such an advocate as never before had moved the public heart in their behalf. She visited them in their wigwams, followed them on their trail, and interested herself especially in the Mission Indians of Southern California. With stirring and indignant words she made known the facts of their unhappy fate in the newspapers and magazines of the country. The result of her investigations she published in a volume in 1881, entitled *A Century of Dishonor*, which made such an impression that the notice of the government was attracted by it, and President Arthur appointed her one of a commission to examine into and report the true condition of Indian affairs. She made her first report in 1882, which gave her friends great satisfaction. She had done a faithful work. Her interest in and knowledge of the history and state of these sons of the



forest furnished the material for her last work, that prose classic, *Ramona*, the most worthy product of her genius. Her own feeling about her labor on behalf of the Indian is expressed in a letter to a friend, bearing date of July 27, 1885, only a few days before her death: "I feel that my work is done, and I am heartily, honestly, and cheerfully ready to go. In fact, I am glad to go. You can never fully realize how for the last four years my whole heart has been full of this Indian cause—how I have felt, as the Quakers say, 'a concern' to work for it. My *Century of Dishonor* and *Ramona* are the only things I have done of which I am now glad. The rest is of no moment. They will live, and they will bear fruit."

The life story of this noble-minded, great-hearted woman shows her to be one of those who "learn in suffering what they teach in song." Sorrow and anguish kindled the fiery furnace which purged her dross and refined her gold. She was born in Amherst, Mass., October 18, 1831. Helen Fiske came of good stock. Her father, Nathan Welby Fiske, was an eminent Congregational minister, a native of Massachusetts, at nineteen a graduate of Dartmouth College, a tutor for the two years following in his *alma mater*, and a theological graduate of Andover. From 1824 to 1830 he filled the chair of languages, and then was transferred to the chair of intellectual and moral philosophy in Amherst College, which position he held up to the time of his death, which occurred in 1847. He died in Jerusalem, whither he had gone in quest of health, only to be transferred to the heavenly Zion. He was the author of several works, one of which passed through many editions, a translation of Eschenburg's *Manual of Classical Literature*, a work used extensively in college study many years ago. This book he translated from the German in 1836. He was a clear thinker, with a philosophical and linguistic bent of mind, whose life at Amherst had much to do with laying foundations for the work so successfully carried on at that educational center to-day. Her mother was a woman of literary tastes and sunny temper. The two sons of this strict Calvinistic family dying early, only the two daughters remained. Anne, now Mrs. Bamfield, resides in Wolfboro, N. H. Their mother died when Helen was twelve years of age, and their father three years later.

The best that wise forethought could devise was done for

Helen to secure that culture of mind and heart which would fit her for noble and capable living. Versatile, full of life and sparkle, she was even as a girl quite a character in that quiet New England town. Her naturally brilliant intellect, ready wit, and discriminating judgment found still higher direction and cultivation by the privileges afforded at Ipswich Seminary and at Abbots, N. Y.

At twenty-one she was happily married to Major Edward B. Hunt, a gentleman of excellent literary and scientific attainments, and an enthusiast in his devotion to his country. And so her wedded life became an army life. Graduating at West Point Military Academy July 1, 1845, he had risen gradually from the rank of brevet second lieutenant to that of major. His services were in demand for various posts and undertakings, from a professorship at West Point to the construction of important fortifications along the coast line from Connecticut to Florida. Their domestic bliss was hallowed by the gift of three sons and a daughter. But their unshadowed happiness was brief, for it was not long before three little sodded mounds lay side by side in the military cemetery on the banks of the Hudson. Major Hunt was killed on the morning of October 2, 1863, while firing a submarine torpedo, an invention of his own, as his naval ship lay in port in the harbor of New York; and at the age of thirty-two Helen Hunt stood leaning upon the arm of her first-born, her dark-eyed Rennie Warren, beside the open grave of her husband. Her stricken heart clung with tenacity to the only remaining tie with such tender affection as only the heart of a mother can know. The image of his father, the stay of her widowhood, the ambition and hope of her future, in that boy all her life was now centered. Imagine the awfulness of her desolation when only two years later her splendid boy, her earthly all, was snatched away by diphtheria in 1865. On his deathbed he made her promise not to take her own life in order to follow him. He even pledged himself to revisit her in spirit that he might share with her the burdens. But just so sure was she that reappearance and communication from the world of spirits was from the very nature of the case impossible that, while spiritual realities were familiar to her thought, the special doctrine of "spiritualism" she utterly disavowed.

In thirteen years she was *fiancée*, bride, mother, widow, and childless! Was ever brightness overwhelmed in deeper gloom? Did ever joy vanish more completely from a human life? No wonder that for long, weary months she was unseen even by her nearest, dearest friends. In her ruined and empty home at West Point she sat moaning bitterly, "I alone am left, who avail nothing." But after many months of solitary mourning, alone with her own heart and with God, she reappeared among her friends. She had felt that life with her was done. But gradually a new sense of duty and of privilege came to her. Outwardly, she made no show of her grief; she shut her sorrows down in the recesses of her own heart. What she learned in the school of sorrow she sung in song and poesy. Her sufferings were for herself, while the blessedness which accrues from suffering she gave for the cheer and uplifting of others. Out of her own sorely afflicted soul, as with a pen dipped in her heart's blood, she wrote those pathetic lines entitled "The Loneliness of Sorrow:"

Friends crowd around and take it by the hand,  
Intruding gently on its loneliness,  
Striving with word of love and sweet caress  
To draw it into light and air. Like band  
Of brothers, all men gather close, and stand  
About it, making half its grief their own,  
Leaving it never silent nor alone.  
But through all crowds of strangers and of friends,  
Among all voices of good will and cheer,  
Walks Sorrow, silently, and does not hear—  
Like hermit whom mere loneliness defends;  
Like one born deaf, to whose still ear sound sends  
No word of message; and like one born dumb,  
From whose sealed lips complaint can never come.  
Majestic in its patience, and more sweet  
Than all things else that can of souls have birth,  
Bearing the one redemption of this earth  
Which God's eternities fulfill, complete,  
Down to its grave, with steadfast, tireless feet  
It goes uncomforted, serene, alone,  
And leaves not even name on any stone.

As years went on Helen Hunt grew dear to many. Hundreds of obscure men and women in farmhouses and factories culled her poems from the newspapers, memorizing them while at work, or pasting them into homemade scrapbooks, or pinning them fast to the leaves of the family Bible. One of these,

with the title "Best," has comforted many a weeping Rachel, grieving over the loss of her little ones whose laughter had made music in the house and whose arms around mother's neck had been a more blessed ministry than words can describe. The rich pathos and gentle resignation are wrought out sublimely :

Mother, I see you with your nursery light  
Leading your babies, all in white,  
To their sweet rest ;  
Christ, the good Shepherd, carries mine to-night,  
And that is best !

I cannot help tears, when I see them twine  
Their fingers in yours, and their bright curls shine  
On your warm breast ;  
But the Saviour's is purer than yours or mine—  
He can love best !

You tremble each hour because your arms  
Are weak ; your heart is wrung with alarms,  
And sore oppressed ;  
My darlings are safe, out of reach of harms,  
And that is best.

You know over yours may hang even now  
Pain and disease, whose fulfilling slow  
Naught can arrest ;  
Mine in God's gardens run to and fro,  
And that is best.

You know that of yours the feeblest one  
And dearest may live long years alone,  
Unloved, unblest ;  
Mine are cherished of saints around God's throne,  
And that is best.

You must dread for yours the crime that sears,  
Dark guilt unwashed by repentant tears,  
And unconfessed ;  
Mine entered spotless on eternal years,  
O, how much the best !

But grief is selfish, and I cannot see  
Always why I should so stricken be,  
More than the rest ;  
But I know that, as well as for them, for me.  
God did the best !

It was only after she had been called in her sad young widowhood to give up the last tie, her beautiful and gifted Rennie Warren, on whom she had lavished an almost idolatrous affection, that her whole great nature went out in tender words

and philanthropic deeds to other lives as crushed and lonely as was hers.

But Helen Hunt's writings do not all breathe the air of sadness. They abound with lovely word-pictures of the grandeur of the mountains; of the exquisite wild flowers, the gentian, the purple asters, the golden-rod, and her favorite, the clover blossoms; of the wild songsters of the woods, rippling brooks, and the happy innocent days of childhood. There are poems of the days, and the months, and the seasons; there are exquisite portraits of biblical and modern characters. There are dream scenes and pictures of real life. She knows, too, the zest of action and the joy of doing good. It was at Newport, R. I., that she began what proved to be a brilliant literary career. Her writings came to be in wide demand. The *Nation*, the *Independent*, the *Century Magazine* sought them, and made her known to all the world. In 1872 she was an invalid in California. Obtaining small relief, she came to Colorado, and spent the winter of 1873-74 at Colorado Springs, where she met William Sharpless Jackson, a Quaker of quiet and dignified Christian character. On October 22, 1875, she changed her name to Helen Hunt Jackson. Here, in one of the most beautiful cities of the Centennial State, on a sightly corner lot their home was built to her liking, and for ten years was the center of sunshine and love. She died in San Francisco, August 12, 1885, after a four months' painful illness. Her mortal remains now rest in the beautiful Evergreen Cemetery, near Colorado Springs. Her home is preserved just as she left it. Her library, writing desk, pictures, and all, are there to receive a silent reverence from those whom her personality or her writings have made her friends. Such persons visiting her home to see where she dwelt are treated with becoming courtesy. In the town her memory is deeply revered. The social circle in which she mingled, though not large, was bright with many a charm, she herself being its center and principal light.

Augustine W. Armstrong

## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

WHAT Matthew Arnold abominated most in American life was our daily newspapers, which he regarded as a terror, a really "awful symptom." The solidarity of the daily press has been a very serious obstacle to the reform of that part of it which is reckless and lawless. For, no matter how much newspapers have differed in character, the better class has for the most part extended the protection of silence over the worse. This silence has been broken at last, and the press has undertaken the office of self-purification. The sharp criticism of "yellow journalism" by such papers as *The Sun* and *The Tribune* of this city is encouragingly significant. For a long time the line between decency and indecency was left to be discovered by the readers of newspapers, and journals which took pride in their own honesty had no word of rebuke for the dishonest sheets—none on the score of their tricks, lies, and shamelessness. The purification of the press is assured by the enrollment of high-class papers in the reforming ranks. "The power of the press" has not been in recent years a subject for unmixed gratification—so much Satanic power was included in the phrase, and so doubtful has it been that the good exceeded the evil. A hope has now sprung up in good men's hearts that the balance of power will soon be unmistakably on the right side.

It always has been, and will be, true that no paper can be a great one without the patronage of decent people; and the better readers have always had it in their power to enforce decency in the journals they patronize, either as advertisers or readers; but the standard of decency needed definition, and editors are, in the very nature of the case, the best judges; and so long as they rendered no judgment readers might be excused for giving the viciously "enterprising paper" the benefit of a doubt. The expression "yellow journalism" is a verdict in itself, a verdict rendered by the most competent authority in the premises. Yellow is the color of the flag raised over a pesthouse or a ship which has on board some contagious disease, warning off all who



do not wish to catch the plague. The crime of the yellow journal is : Telling lies for truth ; putting gossip on a level with facts ; painting insignificant things in gaudy colors to make them seem important ; invading the privacy of men and women for bad purposes of many kinds ; printing in glaring type the prurient details of crimes or scandals ; exercising a kind of immoral police power over citizens weak enough to fear "the papers" more than they fear to do wrong and to evade doing right lest such conduct be construed clean from its purpose. One of the dangers of life in a great city is the yellow journal, a wild beast worse than any in an Indian jungle. It is worthy of note that at the time of the prize fight which some months ago disgraced the State of Nevada the *New Yorker Staats Zeitung*, the leading German daily of this country, having an immense circulation, contained not the slightest mention of it, shutting it out even from its news items, while the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* only included the fight in its condensed summary of events, treating it as it would any repulsive and corrupting crime.

---

HENRY DRUMMOND was a blending of Dwight L. Moody and Herbert Spencer, steeped in modern science and at white heat of evangelic fervor, a college professor of physical science and a revivalist at home and abroad. Whatever one may think of the reasonings in his books, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* and *The Ascent of Man*, he was a standing proof that ardent spirituality and the scientific spirit are not incompatible, but can dwell together and interfuse in one and the same man, each intensifying or at least not nullifying the other ; that a fearless thinker may be a devout and humble Christian. Criticised as he was by both scientists and theologians as unscientific in believing in the voice of the Spirit and as unsound in laying undue stress on the revelations of nature, neither scientist nor theologian can deny that intellectually and spiritually he was a sweet, intense, and radiant personality whom to know was to love ; in his way and measure a burning and a shining light. In no other land, perhaps, was such a man more likely to arise than in Scotland, where a searching, debating, and testing mental activity works over profound religiousness and fervid convictions. Drummond began his public religious work by accompanying Mr. Moody for nearly two years as assistant evangelist in a tour through Great Britain ; and ever thereafter his soul was aflame with zeal and his lips pleaded with men to be reconciled to God. His greatest work was among

young men, especially students. From the wonderful religious awakening which came down upon Edinburgh in 1884, when the Odd Fellows' Hall back of the university was crowded with a thousand Edinburgh University men in quiet, solemn, and powerful revival services conducted by Professor Drummond, until sickness disabled him two years ago, he never lost his power over the students. It is said in Scotland that, more than any man of his time, he influenced intellectual young men for Christ. The fine, frank, keen, earnest, uplifted manliness in him appealed to the aspiring possibilities of manliness in them. His calm, face-to-face, peremptory message was, "Brothers, Christ is your King. Surrender to him here and now. Choose him, submit to him, love him, live for him, die for him, serve him forever;" and so keen and piercing was his appeal, so straight home to the vitals, that the strongest frames quivered, the brightest spirits bowed to the summons, and went forth by hundreds, some to the ends of the earth, brilliant, athletic, eager, and militant for Christ. Modest, pure, and brave, Henry Drummond was the Chinese Gordon of evangelism in the religious life of Scotland, with a similar magnetic moral mastery and power to subdue not merely the weak but the strong. The fervent ministry of this unordained preacher had all spiritual signs of the true apostolic succession; but in its form, argument, tone, and accent, it was a variation of type from those of the elder day. In the substance of a large part of its truth his message to his time was as old as the sun; in attitude, address, and cadence it was all as modern as this morning's sunrise. It points to a coming time when the Holy Spirit and the scientific spirit will walk together, leading man between them in the way of life and light and glory everlasting. Some things which he discussed we cannot see as he saw them, but the fact that we differ with part of his teachings does not prevent us from recognizing that he made a sincere effort to interpret old truth in the light of new knowledge for his generation. Such work, done even by the wisest, has its risks; but, in the interest of intelligent, honest, and living belief, it must continually be done.

---

#### THE SUPREMACY OF SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

No other questions interest the modern world more than social questions. Some profess to see in this fact a proof of social disorder and a symptom, perhaps a prophecy, of revolution; but they hardly establish their inference. No one believes that in

the heart of Africa social conditions are perfect ; but the black citizens of the Congo have never so much as heard of social questions. Life is certainly hard among the Eskimos ; our least fortunate fellow-citizens would not willingly become Eskimos ; yet social discontents are unknown in the arctic circle. Wherever life is hardest there is the least thought or concern about social problems.

Perhaps the truth is that social questions are taking their turn as subjects for general consideration. The old controversies have relapsed into silence. In religion a general peace prevails. In government most enlightened men easily agree about principles. In science, after expecting everything from exact knowledge, we have come to expect nothing of an order higher than the utility of things—nothing different in nature from the oldest and simplest bit of knowledge—and, therefore, science is not as inspiring as it was thirty years ago. Something new was to be expected as the common mental plaything of mankind living by steam and electricity. For moments we get diversion out of a book on decadence or a novel about a magdalen; but such play is short, and a large and long game of intellectual football is a promise of rare pleasure.

There can be no doubt that the changeful elements introduced into life by invention have contributed to raise social questions to the first place; but these elements were here forty years ago, when science, slavery, parliamentary government, and "the testimony of the rocks" commanded all our attention. Then voices which claimed apostolic powers—Fourier's, for example—were barely heard and swiftly forgotten; now a crazy fanatic may have the world for an audience if he declaims against social wrongs; and a madman's scheme of social regeneration will be candidly and thoroughly considered. Probably we shall exhaust the subject, looking at it from every point of view, weighing the merits of every reform proposed, whether by rational people or by madmen—and then take up some new form of intellectual occupation.

This is not written in jest or to disparage the seriousness and enthusiasm of believers in social regeneration through some new system. This enthusiasm, this quasi-religious devotion, is a beautiful manifestation of the human soul; and from the new dreams of golden ages to be unrolled by social changes there may come the sober thinking and chastened feeling which old truths clothed with divine authority are adapted to develop in good

men's souls. The indestructible truths are waiting for us; and they are not new.

The problem of problems in social humanity is how to promote—as Lamennais expressed it a good while ago—the *mutual giving of man to man*. We shall come back to the convictions of Lamennais that this end cannot be reached by any material constraint, by any political method, by any “lay preaching;” that nothing less than a religion of self-surrender to the common service will promote the high social health which we desire. Or, put in a different way, the social problem is, how can we completely subject the individual to the service of society and at the same time give to the individual his highest development? The two ends are one end in this respect, that society gains nothing from the service of weak and servile individuals, that the individual will be subjected in vain if the subjection reduces his value to that of a common and routine drudge. The outflashings of genius, the power of invention, the gift of combination, the apostolate of leadership—when will the world cease to need them?

Now, then, the old truths which are waiting for us are in part summaries of experience, purporting that the free man is worth more than many slaves, and purporting much more in the order of practical human life. But the larger and more inspiring truth awaiting us—when we shall have played out our game of social reconstructions—is that *the mutual giving of man to man* is the very end of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the very heart of our religion. This Gospel is the only thing in all our human history which flatly and absolutely negatives living to oneself, which unequivocally commands and unceasingly constrains us to the mutual giving of man to man. One of its most suggestive precepts is, “*Freely ye have received, freely give.*”

---

#### THE LAW OF PARSIMONY.

THE decree has gone forth that expenses must be reduced throughout all systems of thought. The agent of a modern consensus is going through the entire range of our intellectual operations discharging supernumeraries, issuing orders to dispense with superfluous theories, postulates, and doctrines, saying, “This, that, and the other is unnecessary; I’ll show you how to do without it.” The agent of this general reduction walks in among the theologians and says, “In order to enable your theology to meet the demands of reason and fact you must cut off various extrava-

gant doctrines ; if you do not, bankruptcy impends ; you are indulging in unjustifiable luxuriousness of belief." To evangelical Churches the agent says, " You must aim at greater terseness in your creeds by wiping off superfluities ; faith must be more frugal, more circumspect, circumscribed, and abstemious in its affirmations." From various pulpits and printed pages the devout are told that they have believed too much about God, Christ, and the Bible. It is announced that hard times, a period of depression, with panics and crashes, is at hand for Faith, and she is warned that the shrinkage of securities has so cut down her income that she must reduce her style of living and practice rigid economy. The law of parsimony is pressed upon our intellectual and religious life from various directions, by physical science, by antichristian philosophies, and by rationalistic biblical criticism. Our interpretations of the Bible, of human nature, human life, and the world are bidden to use lower and cheaper theories. One voice or another orders us to dispense with views which regard the Holy Scriptures as the product of special divine inspiration, or in any respect supernatural ; to dismiss our ideas of a divine Providence, or of the value and reasonableness of prayer, or of the influencing of the human spirit by the divine, or of the imperishability of man ; to surrender the miraculous, including the supernatural Christ and his deeds, and to postpone, retire, and if possible do without a divine Creator.

The law of parsimony requires that all investigations in science, philosophy, or theology shall ask at every point, " What are the fewest number of data which, being granted, will explain the phenomena of experience ?" In scientific study, for example, nothing short of necessity justifies the framing of a new hypothesis. Only when known data fail to account for phenomena does science tolerate the supposition of a factor not as yet defined, identified, registered, appraised. Only when chemistry is unable to account for a compound by any possible combination of known elements does it admit as probable the presence of a new and undiscovered element. Not until astronomy is at a loss to explain the perturbations of Uranus does it suppose the existence of Neptune.

It is only fair to say that the animus of physical science is sometimes misjudged, its habitual attitude being construed as essentially hostile to faith and religion. Naturally enough, natural science holds no brief for theology ; indeed, it has no license to practice in that circuit ; its province is the natural and not the

supernatural. Physical science appears skeptical for the reason that it labors strenuously to reduce belief to a minimum, to diminish the necessity for it by substituting knowledge for belief as far as possible; thus its push is in the direction of driving faith out of the world. Physical science appears antiscientific for the reason that it holds back from consenting to suppose supernatural interference or action wherever and so long as it can possibly explain observed facts by natural agencies and processes. Physical science seems atheistic because it fights off the necessity of admitting the active presence of a God wherever and whenever it is able to show that Nature can keep house and do business without him. With a territorial ambition equal to that of Russia, it contends against theology over every foot of ground, saying to itself, "I'll see if I'm not strong enough to seize and hold this region for myself." But in all this there is no malice. Science is only pursuing its vocation and magnifying its natural function, holding lawfully enough that all things which it can cover in under its explanations rightfully belong to it and not to theology. There is no necessary irreverence in the effort to find out how far new species are developed out of those already existing without the expense of fresh interventions of creative power; and if science even pushes on to see whether all things may not have evolved from one primal germ, we see no reason for opposing or denouncing its effort, although, and inasmuch as, faith in its success remains optional with us.

Without inveighing against, but, on the contrary, approving every lawful application of the law of parsimony, it is yet proper and necessary to remark that there are numerous postulates, assumptions, and beliefs which cannot be dispensed with under any such law, because human nature cannot do without them. To begin at the beginning, the most economical reasoning cannot dispense with a sufficient Cause; and to postulate back of all secondary causes a great First Cause is a sheer necessity of human thinking. Behind all possible explanations is a great inexplicable Somewhat beyond which the mind cannot go—which cannot be merged into, derived from, or explained by anything precedent to or greater than itself. What is the nature of that supreme, original, independent Fact? The materialist answers, "Matter alone, containing in itself the promise and potency of all things; matter from which mind and spirit are effluences like the flame from the candle." The pantheist replies, "The universe as a whole, including both mind and matter indistinguishably



mixed in a mysterious unity." The spiritualist says, "Spirit alone; mind independent of and superior to matter; spirit by which all things have been caused and produced." But no answer is quite so satisfying to man's total nature as the theist's explicit and positive affirmation of a self-existent Personal Intelligence as the primal Fact and great First Cause.

Science and philosophy join with common sense in pointing to the necessary priority of mind as the only entity or mode of existence which is real in its own independent right. To-day physical as well as mental science moves straight and fast toward the conclusion that there is no motion without mind. The most advanced knowledge confirms the unquestioning belief of primitive man that it is his spirit which animates his body, and also the validity of the further inferential belief that as the movements of his body are caused and controlled by his mind and its volitions, so the movements which he sees in the world of nature must be due immediately or remotely to the volitions of a mind. Is any conception saner than that which sees back of or within all physical processes a psychical energy and regards "natural causation" as only the observable aspect or result of an invisible volitional action, tracing all things up to an Absolute Volition, to one divine Will? The ultimate, basal, insoluble mystery is One who is beyond our comprehension but not beyond our knowledge—of and to whom we say, "Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God;" and who can himself give to us no account of his own being except in words like these, "I am that I am."

In the simple admission of one original Cause, itself independent, with all else depending upon it, more is involved than appears. Herbert Spencer says that our belief in a First Cause is the most necessary of all beliefs, having demonstrably a higher warrant than any other, the existence of such a cause being the most certain of all certainties. Later he says that the nature and attributes of that First Cause are unknown and unknowable, but in so saying he contradicts himself, for in his very statement of its existence he assigns to the First Cause these three attributes, causal energy, omnipresence, and eternity; and afterward, when he declares that the cosmos is undeniably regulated by law and to manifestly beneficent results, he implicitly attributes wisdom and love to the First Cause, to whose nature he thus with positive affirmation gives features so many and lineaments so distinct

that we Christians recognize our God—omnipresent, eternal, almighty, all-wise, and all-good—in Mr. Spencer's description of his great First Cause. The professor of agnosticism gives us a broad as well as definite warrant for our faith in God.

The lowest reduction alleged to be justified under the law of parsimony is materialism's theory. The materialistic explanation of the cosmos would be "dirt cheap" if it were thorough and honest, but it is not, for the professed materialist does not really dispense with a God: he only makes believe, for in attempting to account for things from his standpoint he is obliged to endow matter with the attributes of mind. The materialist's matter is most amazing and incredible stuff. He explains the intelligible order of the universe by attributing intelligence to the atoms, and shows us each monad deporting itself like a little god, guiding itself by an omniscient intelligence which foresees and adjusts with the action of all other atoms the universe through. This is a very costly theory, far more expensive than the theistic hypothesis; it lays on human credulity a tax heavy enough to bankrupt faith entirely. The materialist is an impostor, a sleight-of-hand man with a god up his sleeve. Into his material universe he clandestinely imports a concealed deity, and thus his pretended materialism becomes essentially pantheistic. If the universe is not the creation of an eternally self-existent divine Being, then the universe is itself self-existent and eternal, and, we are obliged to add, intelligent. Any theory which dispenses with a transcendent, personal First Cause practically lands us in pantheism, the first difficulty with which arises from our inability to conceive of mind, spirit, and will separate from personality; although this, we are told, is not a real difficulty, arising out of the nature of things, but only apparent and due to the necessary limitations of finite human minds. In parenthesis, it may be admitted that pantheism is not the worst of beliefs and solutions. Though beset with difficulties, formidable and to us insurmountable, it is rationally, at least, as much superior to positivism as the whole is greater than a part.

The law of parsimony makes it an unjustifiable extravagance for science or philosophy to keep a God unless there is something for him to do. But when materialistic thinkers have done their best to prove this living universe to be independent and self-supporting they are, after all, obliged to admit that there are several places where a Deity may be in hiding, with perhaps some useful function to fulfill, some legitimate occupation to employ his ener-

gies upon while the ages roll. At several critical points, indeed, a God still seems quite indispensable; for example, at the origin of matter, the origin of life, and the origin of man. No wise person has come anywhere near explaining how these origins came to be without resorting to that ancient, yet ever fresh, immensely capable, and in fact all-sufficient theistic hypothesis. For matter, life, and man science can write no Book of Genesis; and the prospect is that it must accept essentially the account given in the first pages of Holy Scripture, or be like that staircase on the top of Milan Cathedral, which starts from the marble roof but ends in vacancy without a landing. It grows plainer every day that any study of origins necessitates God. At every real beginning one is compelled to posit a divine Creator. The theist need not fear to accept any or all of the mechanical explanations furnished by science, inasmuch as those explanations do not account for the existence of anything. Physical science talks learnedly of development, but origination is hid from its ken. The processes of growth and unfolding from and after any beginning may be open in a measure to its study, but beginnings remain absolutely inscrutable to its search; of them it can only say, "I have not seen, neither can I understand." All real origins lie beyond scientific knowledge. They are due not to matter but to spirit. To account for them mechanical explanations fail and natural causation is inadequate. All natural causes are secondary causes. The great First Cause is a supreme, almighty Spirit, the author and sustainer of what we call Nature. The geneses of matter, life, and mind, of sentiency, instinct, rationality, self-consciousness, morality, religion—these origins remain, despite all claims and theories, essentially inexplicable to science. Around the borders of those inaccessible primordial regions baffled human research blindly gropes, finding no thoroughfare; and when above each of those dense, impenetrable, genetic mysteries an august Voice is heard saying, "In the beginning God," there is no speech or language with which science or philosophy can answer back against the sublime sufficiency of that rationally authoritative declaration. Renan may call the Book of Genesis a myth, but the plain alternative for him and for all men is Genesis or nothing. In the nature of things certain secrets can never be uncovered by natural science. Man can no more explain the world than he could make it. Only Omniscience can fully understand that which only Omnipotence could create.

If the extreme evolutionist, in his effort to reduce the number

of beginnings to a minimum, could trace all things back to the protoplasmic or primary cell, he would there be obliged to admit a divine Creator. And so the most radical theory of evolution keeps at least one room reserved for the Deity, a little chamber on the wall wherein not only the man of God may rest in faith, but the God of man may permanently dwell. But a God cannot be kept locked up in a cell any more than God's Son could be kept locked fast in a sepulcher with a sealed stone and a Roman guard; if God is anywhere he is everywhere by the mere fact of being God. Every enterprise of reasoning that sets out to exclude the Deity from anything is bound to end by confessing him to be in everything, the omnipresent, all-sustaining, all-animating God. Aubrey Moore says, "Darwinism has conferred upon philosophy and religion an inestimable benefit by showing us that we must choose between two alternatives: either God is everywhere present in nature or he is nowhere." And since the most resolutely atheistic science could not possibly prove that God is nowhere, Darwinism itself must affirm and insist that he is everywhere, that what is called natural causation is only the mode in which the divine Being is omnipresently and eternally operating, and that it is absurd to talk of "mechanical necessity" as an explanation of anything that comes to pass.

The creative intelligence which affords the only explanation of origins manifestly animates and guides the originated universe. "Wherever we tap organic nature," says an eminent scientist, "it seems to flow with purpose." Common sense insists that this seeming shows a genuine reality; nothing less than intelligence could cause anything to simulate intelligence. Along with the operation of intelligent purpose there is everywhere evidence of some one supreme integrating power pervading the cosmos and giving observable unity thereto. This universally coordinating power can be nothing less than spiritual. Cosmic unity and the uniformity of phenomenal sequence in nature are effect and proof of the omnipresence and consistency of one supreme and controlling Volition. In the presence of the perfect correlation of natural laws and processes in the production of cosmic harmony the newest thinking finds the old-fashioned theistic hypothesis a very great convenience, for no one is able to suggest or imagine how that universal correlation can be otherwise accounted for.

As every line of scientific investigation finally runs into a *cul-de-sac*, so all metaphysical inquiry ultimately strikes against the inexplicable, halts there, and all its after effort in that direc-

tion is only marking time, not marching. Metaphysics fails to explain entirely the nature of beings, their laws and actions. After it has done its best there is always an unexplored remainder, an unmeasured and unanalyzed residuum. All its equations contain the symbol of an unknown quantity, the value of which must be ciphered out before the problems of metaphysics can be solved. The metaphysical X stands for the signature of a Deity who makes his mark, and, for aught the metaphysician can say to the contrary, the Christian's personal God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, may be behind that X. At any rate the metaphysician cannot complete his work without calling in some kind of a Divinity. Even when he attempts to dispense with the anthropomorphic God of Christianity he is obliged to postulate some other sort of a divine Entity. To us it is clear that in the inn which the scientist and the metaphysician keep there is room for God the Father and for Jesus Christ the Son.

The law of parsimony cannot shut out Christianity. One of our necessities, in order to be at peace with the system of things, in order to believe life worth living, in order to keep ourselves out of the madhouse, in order to keep from regarding the universe itself as one vast madhouse, is that we find some respectable and measurably intelligible meaning to our human existence. This our moral and our rational natures demand. Now, the fact is that no worthy rationale has been suggested for the world, no decent justification of human life, except on the Christian theory that we are in a sphere of moral probation and a school for discipline; and from that point of view one of the most inveterate skeptics of modern times acknowledges that we cannot conceive a system of things better adapted to the ends of such a school than is this life of ours, and that it is not possible to imagine a better master of such a school than Jesus Christ. From which confession it appears that Christ and the world stand together in furnishing perfect satisfaction to the demands of our rational and moral being; and, since such satisfaction is obtainable from no other source, it follows that Christ and the Christian interpretation, being indispensable, are justified even under the law of parsimony.

A marked and dangerous feature of our time is that the law of parsimony is variously misapplied and pressed to unwarrantable and impoverishing extremes. Under its reduction we have lately been presented with an expurgated New Testament. Count Tolstoi eliminates the supernatural from the four gospels and

publishes the result in a volume entitled *The Gospel in Brief*, in which Christ appears as simply a noble man, a wonderful teacher, a gentle martyr. A self-conceit bordering on insanity leads men to an exaggerated estimate of their ability to do without. Grant Allen, the freethinker and freeloader, author of *The Woman Who Did*, dispenses with hymns, Scriptures, and religion as things he has no need for. With audacious self-sufficiency he wrote: "I never needed help other than physical or monetary. My own philosophy has always amply sufficed me." He is satisfied to live and die, with Professor Clifford, "under an empty heaven upon a soulless earth." He carries to the last extreme and widest extent Emerson's idea that "the height of elegance is to have few wants and to serve them yourself." Such ascetic independence inflicts upon itself a stripped and squalid destitution. It is the action of a miser depriving himself of the necessary comforts of life, reducing his legitimate wants to an unnatural minimum, in the insane and indecent ambition to see how little he can possibly get along on, the result being degradation, emaciation, and starvation—parsimony crossing the dead line. Unitarianism has gone so far in the negations of which it is principally made that Stopford Brooke says a belief in God is about all that is left unsurrendered. Liberal theologians also, in other communions, are talking in a way which makes Unitarians claim them as properly belonging in their camp. It is time to warn them all, as Mr. Brooke does, that liberal theology will have to turn about and return to a few clear faiths if it wishes to do anything to meet the needs or promote the happiness and welfare of mankind. This theology has carried its parsimony of faith too far; spiritual inanition, impotence, and imbecility result from the withdrawal of nourishing beliefs. The fact that Unitarians are pointing out to each other that orthodoxy has the larger life gives hope that some of them at least may presently perceive that the larger life is due to the larger faith, and that liberal Christianity is dying of unbelief. There is no mystery in the failure of the Unitarian body to grow. "Over the hills to the poorhouse" is the dismal invitation of the liberal theology, and the hungry souls of men do not find it alluring. We prefer to dwell as our fathers did with abundance of faith in the house of the Lord, who, from the exceeding riches of his grace, giveth us all things richly to enjoy; we will remain where we can delight our souls with fatness and be fed with the finest of the wheat by Him who prepareth a table before us in the presence of our enemies.



### THE ARENA.

---

#### "DID PAUL PREACH ON MARS' HILL?"

THE jaunty air with which Professor Richard Parsons disposes of the criticisms passed upon his article in the *Review* for July, 1896, justifies, we trust, the writer's apparent temerity in continuing this discussion.

"I was on the hill," the professor says, "almost daily for a year, and should know." That settles the question, of course. But one is puzzled to know why he needed to go so many times to become convinced that "there is no reason . . . to claim that the apostle made his immortal address on Mars' Hill." Dr. Harman, too, has been on Mars' Hill, and he gives us a careful description of the place. Poor man! Had he visited the spot "almost daily for a year" he might have made the richest find of his laborious life. As it is, he is permitted to sit at Professor Parsons's feet and "look a little farther in the lexicon from which he so conveniently cites references."

Just here the reader may recall Neander's words: "They took him to the hill where the first tribunal at Athens, the Areopagus, was accustomed to hold its sittings, and where he could easily find a spot suited to a large audience." But Neander had not observed the "discriminating nicety" of St. Luke's prepositions! One can easily fancy Professor Parsons quoting Scripture to the great historian, and saying, "Dost thou know Greek?" Professor Thayer, of Harvard, eminent among lexicographers, stumbles as sadly as Neander, saying, in his monumental work, "To that hill the apostle Paul was led." And the word that trips him is *ἐν*. John Wesley, also, makes the same lamentable slip, in his famous translation of 1754, a work which for accuracy equals the revision of our own day, while often greatly surpassing it in felicitous expression. For he says, "And they took him and brought him to the Areopagus," and in his explanatory note adds, "Or Hill of Mars." To this he appends, translating the twenty-second verse, "Then Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus," and calls it in his note "an ample theater!" But this unhappy expression he had never made had he been permitted to be "on the hill almost daily for a year."

The fantastical fashion of Professor Parsons's review makes it difficult to follow him as closely as we would wish. The writer is not an adept at dust throwing, nor does he claim the high honor of exact scholarship. Nor is it necessary for the case in hand. Professor Parsons objects to our quotations from John and Mark, alleging, by implication, that Luke's use of *ἐν* and *ἐν* is exceptional, if not unique. Unfortunately for Professor Parsons, this is not the fact, and his effort to make it appear so is almost pathetic. For the latest illustration of the vast disparity

"Twixt tweedledum and tweedledee,  
See Brother Parsons on *ἐν*."

Dr. Harman, whose criticism the scholarly readers of the *Review* cannot have overlooked, expresses the exact fact when he says, "The language of Luke is altogether appropriate to the conducting of the apostle to a hill (*ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀρειὸν Πάγον*), *ἐπὶ* with the accusative." This was our sole contention in the *Review* of November, 1896. Professor Parsons admits that *ἐπὶ* sometimes means "unto;" why would he have us infer that it never means "up to?" Because it implies an ascending motion, and that would upset his theory. Both in the gospel and in the Acts, Luke frequently uses *ἐπὶ* with the accusative, in the sense of "to," or "unto," interchangeably with *εἰς* and *εἰς*. So, also, do Matthew and Mark, John and Paul; which scarcely supports Professor Parsons's theory of Luke's singular nicety in the matter of prepositions.

Nevertheless, Professor Parsons insists that *ἐπὶ*, in Acts xvii, 19, means "before," citing Luke xxiii, 1, in support of his position, since the same verb is in both passages. Is that conclusive? Granted that *ἐπὶ*, with the accusative, is here properly rendered "before Pilate," it is, none the less, with Luke an exceptional use of the preposition. Six cases out of Acts can be cited to show that Luke's rule was to use *ἐπὶ* with the genitive in such a case. When he did not, he chose either *ἔμπροσθεν* or *ἐνώπιον*. When St. Paul mentions the appearance of Jesus "before Pilate" he chooses *ἐπὶ* with the genitive, *ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου*.

That the same verb is used in Acts xvii, 19, as in Luke xxiii, 1, settles nothing in the point at issue; for, in Acts xxv, 26, the very same verb is found in connection with *ἐπὶ* governing the genitive, *οὐδὲ προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἑμῶν καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ σοῦ*. "Search the Scriptures" yourself, if you please, Brother Parsons.

Concerning our critic's confident assertion that John was "in heaven" when he "saw the city descending out of heaven" we have nothing to offer in reply, except to say that the exposition discloses an acquaintance with the vision and its topographical features quite in keeping with Professor Parsons's phenomenal familiarity with Mars' Hill. A word, however, may be expected concerning this passage in Rev. xxi, 10, wherein, as in the case of Luke xxiii, 1, 33, and Acts xvii, 19, the preposition plainly implies an ascent to the place or person named. Professor Parsons grossly misrepresents the writer in the repeated charge that we hold to the notion that *ἐπὶ* "signifies 'up.'" That it frequently means "to," and "up to," with the accusative, every novice in Greek well knows. What sense is there in attempting to obscure the fact in the scholarly columns of the *Methodist Review*?

Professor P. appeals to Luke. To Luke he shall go for the settlement of his claims concerning Rev. xxi, 10. See, then, the account of Peter's vision while in "a trance" upon the housetop in Joppa, Acts x, 9, 11, 16, and, by the way, Professor, it reads, *ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα*. Compare the same in the original with Rev. xxi, 10. The meaning is obvious. A glance at the Greek is enough to prove the weakness of Professor Parsons's position.

BENJAMIN COPELAND.

Perry, N. Y.

## THE HUMANITY OF JESUS.

ALL Methodists agree that Christ is divine, but, judging from opinions that have appeared in the *Review* within the past two years, they are far from being agreed as to his human nature. One writer affirms that his humanity "was not only truly human, but warped and biased and weakened by transmission through seventy-five generations of sinners." Another exclaims, "O, thou sinless, unsinning, and incapable of sinning Saviour, glory be to thy holy name!" Yet, if the present writer has the right conception, both views are incorrect and far from the truth. As the doctrine is a matter of divine revelation, human *dictum* is of little force and no authority on the subject. Only the plain teaching of the word, or that which may be logically deduced from it, has any weight in settling the question.

That Christ was possessed of a pure nature is certainly taught in the New Testament. The angel said to Mary, "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Note the exact language. It is the "holy thing" which should be "born" of Mary. One writer argued that, since Christ had a human mother, he must have partaken of her depraved nature, unless the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception be accepted. But this does not follow. It is conceded that the birth of Christ was miraculous. Did divine power exhaust itself in the conception? Might not the same power guard the holy seed and preserve it from defilement? The writer to the Hebrews must have understood that Christ's human nature was so preserved, or he would not have declared him to be "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."

Moreover, Christ's mission demanded that he be free from depravity, that he might be free from the claims of the law and from the penalty of death. Paul says that "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Not actually. An infant of days has committed no actual transgression; yet, being depraved, death claims it as his victim. So, also, if Christ had a depraved nature, death had a claim on him; and he must have died, in order to pay the penalty of his own depravity. In that case his death could by no means have been vicarious. Nay, he himself would have needed a redeemer. But Christ's declaration implies clearly that death had no claim on him. He said: "No man taketh it [his life] from me. . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." It is declared of depraved humanity, "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." But that Christ was specially fitted to make atonement is clearly indicated by the inspired writer when he says: "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared for me. . . . By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."

In opposition to the view here presented it is said that Christ must have been depraved, or the declaration that he "was in all points

tempted like as we are" could not be true. It might as consistently be affirmed that he must have occupied all the positions and relations in life which men and women hold, or he could not have been tempted in all points as we are. For, it is certainly true that every several relation has trials and temptations peculiar to itself. But we know Christ did not hold all, even of the ordinary, relations. He was not a husband or father. It is not probable that he engaged in trade, or in professional duties, or governmental service. Hence he could have had no experimental knowledge of the temptations incident to these relations. It is plain, therefore, that this, like many other declarations of Scripture, cannot be made to go on all fours. The meaning of the text, however, seems simple and plain. A temptation is an unholy incitement of the will to the putting forth of a sinful volition. Psychologists tell us that the will is influenced through the sensibilities, that is, through the emotions, the desires, and the affections. These are the only avenues of approach to the will; and, if Christ was tempted through these several channels, then he was tempted at, rather than in, all points "like as we are." The declaration of the apostle implies neither that his nature was depraved nor that he experienced every possible form of temptation, but that the tempter sought to incite his will by unholy appeals to his emotions, desires, and affections. Everyone who has thoughtfully studied the life of Christ knows that he was assailed at all these points. The comments of Dr. Adam Clarke on this text, Heb. iv, 15, are pertinent.

The theory that Christ could not have yielded to temptation is scarcely worthy to be considered. All Arminian scholars recognize that the will, or power of self-determination, constitutes the true ego. If Christ did not possess this power, instead of being the highest type of man and a true model he lacked the essential characteristic of manhood. If it was not in his power to have yielded to the solicitations of evil, then there was no virtue in his holiness, for real virtue inheres only in a free being. As Dr. Whedon tersely remarks, "The veriest devil might say, 'Make it impossible for me to sin and I will be holy too.'" If men fall before a Saviour who could not have yielded to the solicitations of evil, and was therefore necessarily holy, surely a profounder reverence will be inspired for one who "did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," not from necessity but from choice.

W. H. SWEET.

*Salina, Kan.*

#### THE DEADLY PARALLEL.

No one appreciates more highly than does the writer the services of Mr. Moody as an evangelist and his high personal character. But neither his services nor his high character should blind our eyes to his errors in doctrine, some of which are dangerous, in direct conflict with Holy Scripture, and subversive of a genuine Christian experience.

Recently, in a discourse delivered in Carnegie Hall, New York city, upon the new birth, Mr. Moody—if correctly reported in the New York

*Times*—taught that the “old nature of man” is not taken away, though a “new nature” is given. After the new birth has taken place “he (the new convert) has a nature that reaches up to God, and another that is corrupt and reaches to carnal things.” It is not my purpose to make a reply to this erroneous teaching, but to let Paul, whom Mr. Moody so greatly reveres, give the answer. We place Moody and Paul in parallel:

## MOODY.

When God converts a man he does not take away the old nature of man. He gives him a new nature. Then he has a nature that reaches up to God, and another that is corrupt and reaches to carnal things.

When I was converted I thought at first my old temper would have gone, but I found I still had my temper, and I had a good many things I thought I had got rid of. Then a conflict and warfare came, and I couldn't understand how things were. . . . There has been a conflict right along with me—the higher nature against the lower, the spirit against the flesh. When I become a partaker of God's nature I have a nature that reaches out after spiritual things. The conflict comes when the corrupt nature wants the things of this life.

## PAUL.

Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new (2 Cor. v, 17).

That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. iv, 22–24).

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin (Rom. vi, 6).

But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life (Rom. vi, 22).

Passages of the same character could be multiplied, but these are sufficient. Moody or Paul, which?

A. B. LEONARD.

New York City.

## DR. CROOKS AS SEEN BY HIS STUDENTS TEN YEARS AGO.

ONE of the most impressive memories of Drew Seminary life, ten years ago, centers in the prayers which Dr. Crooks offered daily in the classroom before beginning his lecture to the juniors. They were very brief, not over a minute or so in length, wonderfully concise and comprehensive, and suffused with reverence. They made one think of what the prayers of the Master must have been to his disciples, and of their spontaneous request, “Lord, teach us to pray.”

Dr. Crooks in his lectures showed himself a thorough master of his subject. Although going over the same course year after year, he never relied on past attainments, but was always studying Church history afresh and with the most painstaking care. And how he made the past live again! The apostles in journeys and labors abundant, the martyrs at the scaffold, the councils formulating the creeds of Christendom, the great leaders of Christian thought—Paul, Origen, Augustine, and all the rest—spoke through him again. Dr. Crooks was no antiquarian. He cared nothing

for the rubbish of the past, but was devoted to history for the light it sheds on to-day and on the years to come. He possessed in an unusual degree the judicial mind in dealing with the men and events and doctrines of Christian history. Yet once in a while the fire of a prophet would blaze forth in the indignation with which he would speak of some colossal wrong. Even William Watson might have sharpened his lightnings a little if he could have heard Dr. Crooks on the unspeakable Turk.

Dr. Crooks not only knew Church history, but also how to inspire enthusiasm for its study. It was an unfailing delight to him to direct the reading and research of all who cared to follow out the lines suggested by his lectures. In the classroom he had the reputation of being a hard taskmaster, at times very severe, but he was always ready to deal justly and kindly with his students. He had, in fact, a very genial nature and a heart to match his head. The kindliness of the man fairly beamed from his face as he sat in his large library on Friday afternoons with his students about him and spoke familiarly of the masterpieces of English literature. In his study and in the delightful hospitality of his home he never failed to endear himself to those who in the classroom stood a little in awe of him. Dr. Crooks inspired all who came under his influence with a high ideal of scholarship, and was one of the best illustrations to be found anywhere of the supreme wealth of Christian character and culture. Like the grammarian that Browning tells of, he deserved to be carried by his students and buried on a mountain top.

Here, here's his place, where meteors shoot, clouds form,  
Lightnings are loosened,  
Stars come and go!

For our great teacher was much more than the mediæval grammarian,

Still loftier than the world suspects,  
Living and dying.

*Litchfield, Conn.*

GEORGE C. BOSWELL.

#### THEORIES OF THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT.

OF the two conflicting theories of the divine government only one can be true, and the line of separation is so distinct that there is neither neutrality nor compromise.

The divine government is by law. By this term we mean that law is the rule which fixes the standard of relationship between God, the supreme Ruler, and his subject, man; and that law furthermore prescribes the proprieties of this relationship in the intercourse of those two parties. Law implies individual freedom. It cannot exist except in connection with volitional responsibility, and the fact of its existence demonstrates the fact of alternative choice both with the administrator and with his responsible subject. The other theory is, "There are no alternatives with God, consequently there can be no alternatives with man."

We formulate one proposition, based on these facts. The divine government is under his supreme personal direction, subject to the environment of law, with dual possibility or *bona fide* alternative choice on



the part of the administrator and subject; or it is coercive, and without alternative or possibility of change. Only one of these can be true.

Therefore, if there is no alternative power there cannot be any law, and if there is no law there cannot be any voluntary violation of personal authority, and consequently no offense is committed against the majesty of God. Under such circumstances it is absurd to talk of atonement; for where there is no *bona fide* injury done to the authorities atonement is neither necessary nor possible. A coercive system of government may be imagined as existing at the will of the divine Being, and as being under the direction of his personal presence and supervision; or it may exist as the product of the impersonal forces of nature acting by the power of evolution, or of continuous procession from some sufficient but unknown original center. In either case there is no amenability to law, no guilt is possible, and there is no salvation, as in either case, whether by prearrangement, without alternative choice, or by evolution, which means by continuous procession, that is, without a break, there is no infraction of law. Nothing is forfeited, and there is nothing to redeem; nothing is lost, and there is nothing to save. It appears to us that the scholasticism of this age should correct its vocabulary or conform its theology to the facts in the case.

WILLIAM JONES.

Butler, Mo.

#### "OUR BIBLE AND OUR FAITH."

DR. VAN PELT's well-balanced and altogether admirable discussion of the above subject in the January number of the *Review* seems to me to be open to some criticism. Without specifying the page and express language, unless I have misapprehended him after several careful readings, the discussion conveys the idea that the Bible, being only a medium, and not the object of our faith, has not the importance that recent discussions have given it. All must admit that Christ, and not the Bible, is the object of saving faith. But, while the Bible is only a medium of this faith, the inference that it is only of secondary importance to that faith is not, we believe, in accordance with fact, and departs from the recognized tenets of evangelical theology.

The canvas and paint in a Michael Angelo are only mediums through which we catch the divine ideas of the artist; and yet they are absolutely indispensable to the perpetuation of those ideas. Any tinkering with those mediums mars the idea. The only Christ we know is the Christ of Scripture. The only Christ we can teach to others is the Christ of the Bible, and that, too, after some formulated doctrine at the hands of fallible men, increasing daily in knowledge and wisdom. But is it not reasonable to suppose that, since we are in our present state so utterly dependent for a medium for the knowledge of the divine Christ, we should have from God a medium of absolute perfection? Such is our only primary source of knowledge. To me the Bible is that perfected medium, the *sine qua non* of our faith.

CHARLES L. BOVARD.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.

**THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.****NEW METHODS OF MINISTERIAL TRAINING.**

THE best method of educating those destined for the learned professions, especially for the Christian ministry, is now a matter of discussion. It is somehow assumed by those who write upon the subject that the old method has proved a failure, or at least only comparatively successful. Looking at this subject from the standpoint of Methodists, however, it is clear that our first preachers were eminently successful in practical work. It is true they were revivalists, mostly without the training of the schools, but somehow they attracted all classes to their ministrations. Certainly no charge of failure to reach the masses could be laid upon them.

As the Church grew it became necessary to provide an education for her ministry, and it has therefore been the aim of the Church to secure for those who occupy her pulpits the best possible facilities. At first this education was confined largely to the college work. Later it came also to include a theological course, until now it is recognized as best that the student shall pass through an entire course of academic, collegiate, and theological training. Such is the condition of things to-day, and it is against this order of things that there is a kind of protest, because it is supposed that our preachers fail to reach the masses as they did formerly.

Yet no one would charge this failure, if it be a failure, to ministerial education; for certainly one cannot assume that an educated ministry would be a powerless ministry. It is claimed, therefore, that the difficulty lies in the want of knowledge of the conditions of the so-called "submerged classes." Hence the demand for what is called a new form of education. The recent visit of the senior class of a theological school to the charitable institutions of New York, including its slums and its lowest places, has been largely noticed by the public press. We may well consider whether such a visit should be counted as a part of the education, or whether it should be an incident and illustration in education. That some knowledge of the conditions of society is desirable for a young minister no one questions. But that it should form an integral part of education is the matter that we ought to consider.

The first requirement for ministerial training is that it shall provide discipline, that is, the culture of the powers and faculties of the student to their highest possible limits. The practical work of the ministry is nothing more than the normal exercise of one's faculties. No training, therefore, can be considered adequate for the ministry which is not essentially disciplinary. It is safe to say, therefore, that Latin and Greek and mathematics must be fundamental. Other discipline, it is true, is affirmed by many to be equally productive of mental culture. If, however, we take into consideration the specific culture required for the ministry,

Greek at least is essential for his practical work, and therefore should be required both as a discipline and as an acquisition of necessary knowledge. The present courses of study in our colleges and universities in these particulars is, for the ordinary student, sufficiently limited. The training of a minister must also include a study of the subject-matter of his teaching. This is the peculiar work of the theological school. The ordinary divisions of theological study are exegetical, systematic, historical, and practical theology. Neither of these could be well omitted in any thorough course of ministerial training, and these constitute the present sphere of the labors of theological professors.

It is necessary, however, to consider the attitude of mental training in relation to modern or experimental work. There is, at this time, a manifest distrust of old methods, and a tendency to education entirely by lectures of a character adapted to popular audiences. We cannot hesitate to admit that the ministry of to-day must meet the wants of to-day. The sociological developments of the age form a special subject of study for the ministry, and the university settlements and other organizations have taken a prominent hold on our modern philanthropic life. The institutional Church has come into existence, and what we desire to insist on is that, while a study of these things is desirable as a part of ministerial education, it should not be pursued to an extent which would interfere with the other studies of general discipline and information. In other words, it should be subsidiary and not occupy too much of the time. The training of the head and the training of the heart are so vital that no studies of a practical character, however important, can be substituted for them. The new method has a measure of value. We would, therefore, urge a strict adherence to the old methods of training, and supplement them by courses of lectures on topics of modern progress and the ordinary means of success in the ministry at this time. But we would protest against the new as a substitute for the old.

---

#### THE INTELLECTUAL VIGOR OF OLD MEN.

ONE of the fallacies current in our time is that of attempting to fix an absolute line dividing maturity and old age. It is specially mischievous when the line is drawn by years. Observation will teach us that some men in effective work, in all lines demanding intellectual vigor, are old at thirty, while others are young at seventy. But there now seems to be an increase in the age to which intellectual vigor may be continued.

The position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the primate of all England, who on state occasions ranks next to the royal family, is certainly one demanding the services of a man in the fullness of his strength, and especially mental strength. The dignity of the office is further shown by the salary attached to it, this being about seventy-five thousand dollars a year and the use of the episcopal palace at Lambeth. The present Archbishop of Canterbury was appointed to this high office when

he was seventy-five years old. The recent bugle blast of Mr. Gladstone, from his resting place at the Riviera, on the relations of the European powers to the island of Crete is an astonishment to mankind. It is in line with the other intellectual labors of this distinguished statesman. At an age between eighty-five and ninety he has done a wonderful work in his annotations on Butler's *Analogy*, placing himself side by side with one of the most acute thinkers and reasoners that the centuries have produced. Now, in behalf of Crete, he has awakened the conscience of the world in an appeal to Europe which for fire, logical force, elegance of diction, and eloquence recalls the palmy days of the foremost speaker and statesman of the nineteenth century. In this view the press is a unit. We must not forget the pope at Rome, a few months younger than Mr. Gladstone, who still sends forth his encyclicals abounding in learning, and yet governs the Roman Catholic Church with a clearness of perception and a wisdom in statesmanship which we would expect of a man twenty-five years his junior. The fires of intellect still burn freshly, though the bodily powers have become weak. Bismarck, too, over eighty years of age, still has the vigor to speak to Europe and to instruct the nation in its crisis, and his words are still heard. The *Systematic Theology* of Dr. John Miley is the standard for the training of ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. This work was written between the seventieth and eightieth year of its author, and during his full performance of his duties as a professor at Drew Theological Seminary. It may be said that these are the few; and yet one who would take the trouble to study the mental achievements of the world would find a result not unpromising to the intellectual vigor of men and women, even down to extreme old age. Our youth must not be overproud of their achievements in the presence of such facts as these.

The question before us is, How shall this intellectual vigor be promoted? For whoever aids in lengthening the usefulness of a life is adding another force to the elevation of our humanity. Intellectual vigor may be maintained partly by a care of the physical health. Wasted strength in early life will bear its baneful fruit in old age. So far as is known, the persons whose names we have indicated have lived moderately, indulging not so much in the luxuries as in the necessities of life; in other words, they have taken care of their health. Again, those who have maintained intellectual vigor to old age have mainly been persons who have prepared themselves thoroughly for the work to which they were called. They have developed their faculties by gradual processes, and attained in early years information and discipline which lay at the foundation of their lifework. With this preparation one's profession can be carried on by normal labor, rather than by extraordinary, spasmodic effort. It is not the regular work which wears out a life, but the overpressure which grows out of emergencies for which one is unprepared. The men who have not been prepared for their position by slow and gradual processes find it harder to summon their powers in an emergency, and consequently the strain upon them is greater. Besides, they have the disadvantage of

having to make extra preparation for all emergencies, while one who has been thoroughly and properly trained is not easily taken at a disadvantage. It will be found, in most cases, that persons who maintain intellectual power in positions of prominence for a long period are those who have fitted themselves for it by such gradual processes as have been indicated.

Further, intellectual vigor will be maintained by keeping oneself in constant sympathy with the onward movements of mankind. The world does not stand still. It cannot stand still. One who sits himself down at forty years of age and takes no account of human progress will soon get out of touch with the forces with which he has to do. He will lose sympathy, and will consequently lose intensity, and becomes a follower, and not a leader. The persons to whom we have already referred seem to be awake still to all the problems of life, and hence their ability to speak with authority. Mr. Gladstone is known as a profound student of Greek and Greek literature, and it is not wonderful that his old Hellenic spirit wakes up when he sees little Greece come to the front as a leader and win the respect of the world. He remembers the days of Marathon and Salamis, and somehow sees them repeated in the attitude of the Greeks of to-day. This memory of his early studies has no doubt awakened his sympathies and called forth the intellectual vigor of which we have been writing. We believe that there has been no period in the history of the Church when the worth of old men to the world was more apparent than now; and it is well worth the while of young ministers to ask how they may preserve their intellectual vigor down to the latest period of life.

---

UN SOUND CRITICISM ON MATT. XII, 40, 41.

"FOR as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here" (Revised Version of 1881).

The Book of Jonah has recently been summoned afresh to the bar of criticism, and great learning and research have been expended to show its unhistorical character. Thus far there has been one answer to all attacks on this and many other parts of the Old Testament, namely, that our Lord and Saviour has put upon it the seal of his own authority. It cannot be denied that attempts have been made to invalidate Christ's testimony, without denying his divinity, such as the doctrine of the Kenosis; but they have been recognized as inadequate to explain fully his unqualified utterances.

The most recent effort to set aside the testimony of Christ to the historic accuracy of the Book of Jonah is reported to have been made in Philadelphia. An eminent preacher had given his reasons for his views of the Bible, when he was met by a request to explain in harmony with

his views of the Book of Jonah the passage in Matt. xii, 40, 41. The answer given by the preacher is reported to have been that he did not think that our Lord had said it. He declared that there were many interpolations in the gospels, and that this was one of them. In other words, he took the bold position that the testimony of the most ancient witnesses to the sacred text is not valid, as against conjectural criticism. It is an abandonment of the position of modern scholarship, which demands that we accept the authority of the great manuscripts as final.

The position alluded to, as regards this utterance of Christ, is so extraordinary that it will be important to notice the evidence of the manuscripts with reference to the passage under consideration. The revisers of 1881 have varied from the version of King James only in substituting "Jonah" for "Jonas," "stand up" for "rise," and "for" for "because." So far as the Greek text is concerned the variations are so slight and so slenderly supported that the text of all the great critics is substantially the same. Not a scintilla of evidence exists to disprove our Lord's employment of this language. It is so well attested by manuscript versions that, on the basis of pure criticism, its authority is absolute and final.

It is clear, therefore, that any suggestion of its being an interpolation is purely subjective. This view would involve the abandonment of the laws of textual criticism. Instances are frequent when scholars of highest repute reject a reading which has all internal probability in its favor, because of the character of the external evidence.

This paper is not intended to enter into a formal defense of the historical character of the Book of Jonah. The narrative bears the marks of a veritable transaction, with Jonah and the Ninevites as real characters. To give an allegorical or parabolic meaning to the Book of Jonah is absolutely inconsistent with our Lord's statement in the passage now under consideration. If we apply such a method of interpretation to these words we must also apply it to the other reference in the same connection to the queen of the South who came from the ends of the earth "to hear the wisdom of Solomon." It is apparent that, if the text is assumed to be genuine, there can be no doubt that our Lord recognized the Book of Jonah as a real history.

Two courses only seem to be open to the rejecter of the narrative in Jonah. One is to explain how it was possible for our Lord to have been mistaken in his knowledge of the cases to which we have already made reference; and the other is the method adopted by the preacher to whom we are now here referring, namely, to deny that these words were ever employed by Christ, and to claim that they were interpolations by another person. The far-reaching character of such a method of criticism is at once apparent. If, on the mere assertion of any individual, however scholarly, such a passage of our gospels can be stricken out, against all the testimony of the manuscripts, we are embarked on a sea of uncertainty entirely without chart or compass, and it is impossible to tell whether we shall ever reach a harbor. It would be far better to let inconsistencies stand than to defend the truth by methods so subversive of all right thinking and of true critical procedure.



## ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

## THE BABYLONIAN FLOOD LEGEND.

EVERY great nation has its epic. So had the ancient Chaldeans. This is the great poem of Gilgamesh, king of Erech, which, according to Sayce, assumed its present form during the *renaissance* of Chaldean literature under Khammurabi, B. C. 2356-2301. The entire poem consists of twelve books, "the subject of each book corresponding with the name of the zodiacal sign which answers to it in numerical order." The eleventh canto, having the deluge for its theme, very naturally corresponds with Aquarius, the eleventh sign of the zodiac.

A new translation by Professor Haupt of the Babylonian story of the flood, with comments more or less favorable to the Bible, has of late been published, wholly or in part, in many of our secular papers. As it has been known that the Johns Hopkins professor has been making, for many years, a critical study of the great Babylonian epic it is quite natural that this last version of the ancient song should attract much attention. This new translation, though doubtless in some regards an improvement upon most of its predecessors, contains nothing essentially new, and does not throw any additional light either upon the cuneiform copy or biblical criticism. This is not strange, for every Assyriologist of repute has tried his hand upon the decipherment and exposition of this fragment from the works of Gilgamesh, who till recently was called Izdubar or Gishdubar. We have translations by George Smith and Pinches of the British Museum, Oppert and Lenormant of France, Jensen and Jeremias of Germany, Muss-Arnolt of Chicago, and by others less known.

Though Berosus, the Babylonian historian and priest of Belus, who lived B. C. 330-262, gives a long account of the deluge in his writings—which, however, comes to us second hand through Eusebius, who in his turn had taken it from the works of Polyhistor—it was reserved for the late George Smith in 1872 to prove beyond contradiction that the Chaldeans had literature bearing upon the deluge. One day, while pursuing his work at the British Museum, his heart was made glad when his eye fell upon a large fragment of a tablet from ancient Nineveh bearing the following words: "The mountain of Nizir stopped the ship. I sent forth a dove and it left. The dove went down and turned, and a resting place it did not find, and it returned." Mr. Smith saw at once that he had the story of the deluge before him. Thus encouraged, he kept on faithfully at his work and examined carefully thousands of fragments. Among the endless number of tablets he found a large number treating of the same subject. These, when pieced together, though far from forming a perfect tablet, formed a connected whole. Having called the attention of the learned world in a lecture to his great discovery, he was

induced by the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph*, in London, to undertake at their expense an expedition to Kouyunjik, that is, ancient Nineveh, for the purpose of making systematic excavations on the site of Assur-bani-pal's palace. The result of this, and of another expedition shortly following, was the discovery, not only of many scraps of brick referring to the deluge, but of other numberless tablets, chiefly mythological in their nature, such as the creation, the fall of man, the tower of Babel, the confusion of tongues, the war in heaven, the fall of Satan, etc. We might add here that many fragments, with portions of the deluge story, have been discovered since the death of Mr. Smith.

Such, in brief, is the account of these ancient inscriptions. As excellent translations of the deluge tablets are accessible to all,\* we shall not try to reproduce the whole story, but shall simply emphasize the principal differences and coincidences in the Babylonian and biblical accounts. The biblical story is purely monotheistic, that of the tablets being polytheistic, anthropomorphic, and grotesque. In the latter we have Bel and his followers, Ramman, Nebo, Uragal, Adah, Eunugi, and other inferior gods, bent upon the annihilation of the human race, while rival god, swear bitter vengeance upon their fellows for having brought such a calamity upon the sons of the earth. The reasons for the catastrophe are the same in both accounts—rebellion against heaven and the great moral corruption of mankind. The deliverance of a very small remnant of the race is accomplished in the same way, namely, by means of a huge vessel called an ark in Genesis and a ship on the tablets. The latter, if the translations be correct, was much larger than the former, but both are pitched within and without, and are furnished with a window, door, and roof. The names of the two heroes cannot be made to correspond according to any version. The Bible has Noah, the son of Lamech, while the name on the tablets has been deciphered variously as Shamashnaphistim, Sitnaphistim, Parnapistim, Adrachasis—which inverted reads Chasisadra, and corresponds to the Greek form, Xisuthros. This man lived at Shurippak, on the Euphrates, and his father's name was Ubaratutu. Noah embarks with his own family only, with food, and with many animals; but the man of Shurippak takes also, besides his own immediate family, slaves, artisans, handmaids, as well as all his possessions, including, of course, his silver and gold. Noah himself has charge of the ark, but the Babylonian hero employs Buzur-Sadurabu as captain or pilot. According to the Gilgamesh legend the storm rages only seven days and nights, while the storm which produced the Noachian flood continues forty days and nights. Noah sends out two birds, a dove and a raven. Xisuthros sends three: in addition to the dove and raven, a swallow. Sacrifices are offered according to both accounts. Noah, having lived a number of years, dies a natural death, but the Chaldean hero and his wife are made immortal, and "become like the gods who dwell

\* *Literary Digest*, February 20, 1897, Haupt; *Biblical World*, February, 1894; Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, pp. 107, ff.; Davies's *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*, pp. 111, ff.

on high." Xisusthros and Noah were both supernaturally warned. But as Ea could not disclose the secrets of the gods to mortals, not even to the favorite Xisusthros, the god resorts to a ruse: he divulges the decrees of heaven to the reeds, which in turn sing them out to the man who was to be saved. But here another difficulty arises. The *protégé* of Ea, afraid of ridicule from his fellow-men, hesitates to build a ship or to speak of the impending calamity; but the god once more comes to the rescue, and suggests the following plausible evasive speech:

Bel has banished me and hates me,  
Therefore I cannot stay in your city;  
On Bel's earth I cannot remain,  
To the sea I shall go, to remain with my Lord Ea.

The storm is described in the following highly poetic language:

The dark clouds rose on the horizon,  
In which Ramman lets his thunder crash.  
While Nebo and king go before,  
And the destroying angel strode over mountain and valley,  
Uragal lets loose the elements,  
Adar passed scattering woe,  
All the light is changed to darkness.

The violence of the storm is so great as to terrify not only frail and sinful man, but many of the gods, as we see from what follows:

Brother regards not brother,  
Men trouble not about one another,  
Even in heaven the gods fear the flood,  
They escape to the (highest) heaven of Anu.  
The gods crouch like gods, cower behind heaven's lattices,  
Ishtar cries like a woman in travail,  
The sublime goddess cries with a loud voice.

The gods were prostrated, sat there wailing with woe,  
Their lips were pressed tight together, all were paralyzed.

The description of the sacrifice offered to the gods at the close of the flood is quite anthropomorphic and realistic:

The gods smelled the savor,  
The gods smelled the sweet savor,  
The gods gathered like flies about the offering.

These tablets are very interesting from a literary standpoint. As they are copies of still more ancient ones it is impossible to more than conjecture the age of the original. They are in their present form nearly seven hundred years older than our era. We know this from the fact that they were prepared for the royal library of Assur-bani-pal. From a remark on one of these tablets we further know that the originals from which they had been copied were assigned to the time of Khammurabi, or about seventeen centuries earlier. If, therefore, the Chaldeans possessed such elaborate written accounts of the flood at so early a date it seems folly for the divisive critics to say that any portion of the story as given in Genesis is of exilic or post-exilic origin. Why could this

ancient tradition, found in the beginnings of all history, not have been known to Moses? There is certainly no good reason for tracing the Hebrew account back to Babylonian literature or tradition? The analogies and points of difference between the two, though very striking and numerous, are not of such a nature as to warrant the inference that either one was derived from the other. Though evidently both refer to the same catastrophe, yet they are quite independent; and, as Kalisch has wisely remarked, they and multitudes of other deluge legends "are the echoes of a sound which had long vanished away." It is much more reasonable to think that the story of the flood went along with the early settlers to all countries, and that the account as given in Genesis was substantially known to Abraham and his immediate descendants.

The divisive critics have made much of the difference of style in the composition of what they call the Elohist and Jehovistic versions of the deluge. The one is said to be prosaic and matter-of-fact, the other poetic and elevated. We notice the same peculiarity in Babylonian literature, no matter how far back we go. This is especially true of the deluge tablets. Must we therefore infer a dual authorship for them? Or, to come down to our own times, must we because we find such a variety of styles and of poetic merit in Goethe's "Faust" conclude that it is the work of several writers united into one composite whole?

But, finally, no one can read the Babylonian deluge story without being at once impressed with its inferiority to that of the Hebrews. How is the superiority of the latter to be explained? The simplest way is to recognize in Genesis a supernatural element, which guided the thoughts of a special people selected for the transmission of religious truths for the enlightenment and moral elevation of mankind. This people had, in addition to the traditions common to the race, extra illumination which enabled them to reject the false notions that had crept into the mythologies of the surrounding nations.

---

#### THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

ONE of the last conjectures on the date of the exodus is by Professor Flinders Petrie. In the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology for December, 1896, he fixes the event at about 1204 B. C. His reasoning is twofold: First, from the inscription of Merenptah, he infers that the Jews were not in Palestine on the occasion of Merenptah's victory over them, or the strife would have been recorded in the Book of Judges; and, secondly, there is no account of a campaign by Ramessu III in Palestine, and that the Jewish invasion of that land must therefore have been later than the last campaign of Ramessu III, which seems to have been between 1180 B. C. and 1148 B. C. This would make the Jewish entrance of Palestine about the year 1164 B. C., or the departure from Egypt about 1204 B. C. Whatever the value of this argument may be, it is worthy of consideration, and will doubtless open up the way for a fuller discussion of the chronological problems which are involved.

**MISSIONARY REVIEW.****PROTESTANTISM IN MADAGASCAR.**

THE French have ventured to abolish slavery in Madagascar, an act which has been held for many decades to be perilous because the Hovas, the most vigorous race on the island, are the slave masters, and it was thought dangerous to legislate thus boldly against them. This is but one of the good things the French government has done in Madagascar, but unfortunately the Jesuits dominate its religious movements, possibly laying claim to do so because of their agency in bringing the island to France.

The directors of the London Missionary Society have felt constrained to issue a circular stating the case of the native Protestant Malagasy Church, in which they say that the Protestant natives of Madagascar are in sore straits. They write of them: "In the 'dark days' of persecution (1835-61), to which they often touchingly allude, they had to undergo long-continued cruelty and injustice at the hands of their own sovereign. Last year, again, on the outbreak of rebellion and antforeign feeling following upon the French annexation, it was the leaders of the native Protestant Churches who chiefly suffered. Their friendly relations with Europeans and their prominence as Christians, together with their refusal to join in heathen rites, rendered them specially obnoxious to the rebel bands which at that time were devastating large districts of the central province. Consequently they, more than all others, were the objects of attack. Their houses, chapels, and schools were burned to the ground; their property was looted and destroyed. Were it necessary, the directors could furnish a detailed narrative showing what these Malagasy Protestants then endured." The Protestant world must recognize the right of the London Society thus to express its poignant disappointment, after having spent many millions to civilize and Christianize this island.

The position of Protestant missionaries in Madagascar is exceedingly precarious. They are exposed as Europeans to the wrath of the native tribes in arms against French rule, who do not distinguish between foreigners, and on the other hand the Jesuits seem to have control of French colonial policy. It is enacted that instruction in schools must be given in the French language, and the London Society has handed its schools over to the Protestants of Paris; but their ownership of property is now jeopardized, the Jesuits by trickery and misrepresentation attempting to obtain places of worship raised by Malagasy Protestants. The Jesuits are in many cases the only interpreters to which the government officer has access. The Friends (Quakers) Foreign Missionary Society is in trouble over the loss of their hospital buildings, on which they have spent some thirty-five thousand dollars, besides meeting two thirds the annual cost of support. The French took these buildings for military purposes, as they had a right to do, and the missionaries nursed their sick and wounded

soldiers; but the queen, having been made a Roman Catholic, asked the Mission to relinquish the property under a legal technicality of which she avails herself. The London directors say that this Jesuit persecution, "though differing in form, is carried on with a bitterness, audacity, persistency, and unscrupulousness equal to anything that has marked persecutions in days gone by."

---

#### THE FAMINE IN INDIA AS A MISSIONARY OPPORTUNITY.

THE largest area in India ever affected by famine at one time within the present century is that of the territory now under distress. On the authority of the government of India the statement has been published that thirty-seven millions of people are in districts where the scarcity of food is so great that life cannot be maintained, while there are in addition forty-four millions of people in districts where there is not sufficient food to maintain health. This makes a starving population equal to one and one third times the population of the United States. This does not mean that the whole of the thirty-seven millions will die of starvation, or that all of the forty-four millions will fail in health from want of food. But it does mean that death by starvation and by diseases superinduced by poor food threatens probably one in ten, or perhaps eight millions of people, while the death rate among twice as many millions more is greatly advanced.

The government of India is expending a vast sum of money, and the officials are working beyond their strength in their effort to save life, but it is absolutely beyond the power of the government to keep the people alive. A penny a day is the wages paid on the relief works, food is at famine prices, and large numbers are unable to go to the relief works. There is great difficulty in getting food to the homes of the people where starvation stalks, many being too feeble even to carry it to others. The injustice with which it is distributed by dishonest native agents or seized by the strongest among the villagers, without regard to claims of equity or necessity, also contributes to increase the dire distress which prevails. There is here a large field for private charity, and God seems to call on the Christian world, which has long prayed for the conversion of India, to supplement the subsistence rations provided by public funds, specially among the sick, the infirm, and the little children. The duty is pressing to provide for the maintenance of orphans, and to help those who shall survive, but have lost all, to make a fresh start in life.

It would be far from easy to name a government that has, within the same period and under similar conditions, done so much to become an "earthly providence" to so many millions of people as the British government in India. It has constructed vast systems of irrigation, of water storage, and of railways to prevent the occurrence of famine on a large scale; but all are dependent on the "rain from heaven," and when that fails no human providence can command the conditions. Some slight relief in food supply may have been realized since the first of April, with a harvest of a few kinds of grains. If it rains in June there will be some



hope of the October harvest. But already widows and orphans by hundreds of thousands call for attention and aid. The orphans in particular afford a vast field for Christian missionary enterprise.

---

#### THE STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE IN MISSION COUNTRIES.

SOONER or later, in all successful work among the heathen, the question of a creed comes to the front. The missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church have gradually grown up without any serious trouble on this line. Very early in the history of each of these missions among the great heathen nations the Discipline was translated into one or more of the vernaculars of the several countries, and the native Church has grown up around it without much questioning as to whether it is the best form of symbolic expression. While some have recognized that many of the Articles of Religion are negations, and might possibly suggest rather than repress forms of erroneous beliefs, it has been held on the other hand that these negative propositions only have reference to such inquiries as may arise on the advanced consideration of Christian doctrine, and that it is well for the beginnings of theological thought to be guarded against misconception. Mr. Wesley and the founders of Methodism greatly abbreviated the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England for Methodists. There has, as yet, been little temptation to modify our Twenty-five Articles for our foreign churches, though there can be scant reason for requiring Hindu, Chinese, and Japanese Christians to express any political faith in the republic of the United States as defined in the twenty-third article. The contest in Japan has precipitated, for that country, the question as to how far it is desirable to reproduce the old theological and ecclesiastical controversies that have heretofore excited the Western Churches. The Church of England societies in Japan have made a sweeping concession to the Japanese sentiment by excluding the Thirty-nine Articles altogether from the Japanese prayer book. Bishop Bickersteth justifies this action thus: "Now, the Thirty-nine Articles have no ecumenical authority. They are English of the English, an outcome of the special circumstances of the Church of England in the sixteenth century. They are not, and do not pretend to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine, and were certainly never intended to be imposed as a standard of orthodoxy outside of the British Isles." There is certainly room to exercise robust common sense in all such matters. Nobody can suppose that Bishop Bickersteth does not hold to every iota of doctrine in the Thirty-nine Articles. Yet their incorporation in a Church of totally new environment is a separate question.

---

#### JAPANESE IN TRANSITION.

THE "curiosities of literature" must include the discussions of the Japanese weekly press on the subject of religion. Some of these have recently been occupied with the relation of Christian Churches to foreign

missionaries. Thus, they have declared, "The foreigners are the lords, and we are the servants;" and again, "The only possible way of effecting union between foreigners and Japanese is for the former to recognize our independence, and to show themselves ready to meet us on equal terms." It was this sort of sentiment that drove the Doshisha trustees to turn the American Board out of its own school property, which another Japanese paper declares to be a "narrow-minded, antiforeign policy," that has not "met with the approval of the Christians generally." It adds: "Hence the episode, instead of furthering the cause of independence in the Christian Church, has proved a hindrance to it." Another weekly Japanese paper says that "the day is not far distant when mixed residence will be allowed, and foreigners will be settling in the interior and practicing their religion in our very midst." The writer therefore regrets the antiforeign attitude adopted by many Christian Churches at the present time.

---

#### THE PLAGUE AT BOMBAY.

SEVERAL features of contrast between heathenism and Christianity are finding illustration in the city of Bombay in the presence of the plague which has driven three hundred and fifty thousand persons from the city and has slain several thousands. The superstition of the heathen furnishes a ready explanation of the causes of the great calamity. One reason assigned for the presence of the disease is that the queen of England sent the plague because her statue was defaced a few months ago by some miscreant pouring tar over it; another is that the government will keep the plague there till the livers of five hundred men are sent to the empress. These stories affect missionary work as the people grow terrified at the approach of the Bible woman or the missionary seeking to carry relief, lest these be spies. They refuse to have their houses fumigated, or to carry their sick to hospitals, and live on in the filth, dampness, and darkness of heathenism.

It is said that the native Christians fare far better because of their increased intelligence and attention to hygiene, and because they are less fearful. Very few of them have run away, and most are ready to help save others at risk of their own lives. Many of them go humbly to their work every day, reading the ninety-first psalm. This has attracted the attention of the heathen, who say, "Yes, your God is stronger than our gods, and more merciful;" and some of them pray their gods to let the disease spread among English and Christians, and not to let their people suffer. It is said that up to a late period in February only two native Protestant Christians were known to have died of the plague, though the Roman Catholic natives have suffered a great deal. These, however, live like the native heathen; and as the plague is a "dirt" disease, the substitution of a crucifix for an idol, and of "Hail Marys" for the name of Hindu gods, does not avail against filth, ignorance, and the loss of those moral and religious qualities which are conducive to the resistance of disease.

## FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

## SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

**Wilhelm Schmidt.** Although his opinions are not universally shared by his theological brethren, and, though some of them regard him as able rather than learned, he is, nevertheless, acknowledged to be a powerful factor in present-day thought. We give his views on a few closely-related points. Religion, he holds, is a universal phenomenon of humanity. And as there is no people without a religion, so no individual human being can be originally and absolutely without religion, since each is a product of the general culture of the nation and, with his entire mental life, is rooted in the same. He can become irreligious, but he cannot be religionless. All the various attempts to explain the origin of religion in man by natural psychological processes, from impressions made by the world of sense, or from practical ethical motives, are inadequate. Hence it is necessary to assume a religious capital with which man is originally endowed, a consciousness of God which he finds within himself as soon as he comes to self-consciousness. He cannot avoid entertaining this consciousness of God; and since he is not its real efficient cause it must be regarded as the effect of a divine operation in and upon him. This native consciousness of God is monotheistic. Since it is a necessary effect, its actuality is a guarantee of the objective reality of the idea of God. Its influence, however, upon the individual is dependent upon his subjective treatment of it. The Bible lays claim to this universal revelation for the human race in such passages as Rom. i, 19, *f.*, John i, 5, 9, and Acts xvii, 28. In addition to this revelation of God which is given to every individual human being as a part of his nature, Schmidt believes in the value of a knowledge of the world as an aid to our knowledge of God. Jesus did not exclude a rational knowledge of the world from the domain of religion. In his parables he assumed the facts of the life of nature and of the reality of the world in order to make plain heavenly truths, and called in the aid of rational intelligence in order to aid men in attaining certainty in religious things. Ritschl's fundamental proposition that we know nothing of God except from his revelation to us transcends the idea of revelation. If this proposition were true we could never know anything of God, since his revelation reaches only susceptible natures, those who have a sensorium for his revelation. Historical revelation is necessitated by the fact of sin. Christianity we know to be the perfect religion by its effects.

**G. A. Fricke.** As one who for more than fifty years has been engaged in the study of the proofs of God's existence his ideas on the subject will be of value. He believes that a scientific demonstration of the existence of the personal God, distinct from the world, is necessary, possible, and

effective. It is necessary in order to overcome atheism, which is characterized by hollowness and dilettanteism, and because without such demonstration theology would cease to be a science. It is possible because God is no impersonal abstraction, but in his works is the best attested, most visible, and best known of all beings, and the invisible One only in the sense of the Principle who breaks through all things visible. It is effective, as is proved by experience and observation. There are three principal demonstrations, the cosmological-ontological, the teleological—including Kant's ethico-teleological proof—and the pneumatological. Fricke regards the first two inadequate, since they do not lead to a personal God distinct from the world. The pneumatological demonstration is first ethical. So far it grows out of necessary ethics. Morality is the natural law of the spirit, the content of the *cogito, ergo sum*. The necessity of morality is axiomatic. It is nowhere denied except by certain degenerate individuals. The fulfillment of the moral law must be possible, since man is not a self-contradiction. But this fulfillment cannot be attained without a personal God. The moral law cannot be realized by means of itself, since then the good and the obligatory would be performed because of love to the good and the obligatory. But this is not possible; it is theoretically senseless, and practically of no force. It is a mere phrase. For no man can love law and duty. Love and respect can only apply to persons. Again, self-love cannot be the principle of morality. A certain egoism may be permissible; yet when it is made the measure of our conduct it is not the principle of morality, but the immoral opposite of morality. Nor can altruism furnish us with the principle by which the moral law can be fulfilled. For true love of our neighbor can only rest upon a personal God. To demand that men shall love strangers and their enemies, without belief in a personal God, is senseless and impractical. The moral law is a necessity; it is not possible without a personal God; hence he is. The religious side of the pneumatological demonstration consists in the fact that the phenomena of the religious life cannot be explained except on the ground of a personal God who is absolute love. We give Fricke's ideas on the subject for what they are worth. To us it seems as though it is too strong to consider as demonstrations any of the proofs for the existence of God. But they do make his existence so probable that only the fool can say in his heart, "There is no God."

---

#### RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

**La France et le grand Schisme d'Occident** (France and the Great Occidental Schism). By Noël Valois. Paris, A. Pickard et Fils. 1896. The author describes that period of French history during which France attached itself to the rival pope in Avignon. He begins with the twofold election in 1378. On April 8, 1378, under pressure of the excited populace of Rome, Bartholomew Prignano, Archbishop of Bari, an Italian, was chosen pope as Urban VI. On September 20 of the same year, in

Fondi, Cardinal Robert, of Geneva, a Frenchman, was elected as Clement VII. From that time to this it has been a question which was the rightful incumbent. Contemporaries, councils, modern scholars, have all labored in vain to settle the question. Roman tradition has given its preference to Urban VI, but the Church has never announced a clear decision. Valois, as a historian, does not feel disposed to answer definitely. There was right and wrong on both sides. Conscientious contemporaries were impelled to take one side or the other, simply because of the information which reached them. It is a remarkable, though hitherto a little emphasized, fact that the schism did not begin at once upon the election of Urban VI. Until July, France recognized the papacy of Urban. Nor was it the interposition of the king, but the confidence that he would stand by them, that led the cardinals to choose Clement. The adherents of Clement were France, Savoy, Scotland, and after a period of hesitation, Castile and Aragon; a number of princes on the lower Rhine and in Germany; and Duke Leopold III of Austria, whose adherence was purchased, but whose influence on the upper Rhine was great. On the side of Urban were England and Hungary; King Wenzel; the electors of Cologne, Treves, and the Palatine; and Duke Stephan of Bavaria. The death of Charles V of France left the throne to Charles VI, a nervous, sickly boy who was controlled by his uncles, the dukes of Anjou, Berri, Burgundy, and Bourbon. With the death of the first of these the war between the two popes came to an end. Now the cry for unity became more general; especially did the University of Paris participate in the demand. Upon the death of Urban VI his successor, Boniface IX, was able to win back much of the territory that had been lost. Public opinion made itself felt in the use of published writings, and the call for a council became more and more universal. When Clement VII died, in the year 1394, France had become weary of the schism, and the sense of the real unity of the Church had grown stronger than it had ever been before. This ended, says Valois, not indeed the schism, but this particular form of Gallicanism.

---

**Der römische Konkubinat nach den Rechtsquellen und den Inschriften** (Roman Concubinage, on the Basis of Legal Sources and Inscriptions). By Paul Meyer. Leipzig, Teubner, 1895. This book treats an important feature of ancient ethics, and shows how Christianity dealt with concubinage, which it did not originate, but found existing. The first part treats of concubinage in the times of the heathen, the second in the times of the Christian, emperors. In an introduction Meyer shows that during the older period of the republic a real marriage was called *matrimonium iustum*, while all other sexual relations were designated by *paellatus*. Both, however, assumed the monogamic and permanent character of the relation. The increasing immorality of the end of the republic did not change the legal status of these relations, but it did change the practice. "The *paellax* became the rival of the wife." Augustus, who created the standing army, forbade entrance upon marriage

during the period of service. In order to overcome the consequences of this legislation he lifted one of the many forms of extra-marital connections to the dignity of legality, under the name of "concubinage." The concubine was often the equal of the wife, and often took her place. The emperor Marcus Aurelius would not give his children a stepmother after the death of his wife, but expected his concubine to be a mother to them. The relation was legal, and in some degree respectable. Christianity found these views of marriage and concubinage in existence. In general, the legislation of the Church and of the Christian emperors allowed concubinage to remain, under condition of its being a monogamic and permanent relation. Constantine strove to prevent the taking of concubines instead of wives. The limits of permissibility of the relation were narrowed, and the concubine and her children lost the rights accorded to them by Augustus. Thus was encouraged the exchange of concubinage for real marriage. Justinian proposed to Christianize the regulations of the classical period. Basilius Macedo forbade concubinage in Austria in the ninth century; in the West it remained until the sixteenth century, except for the higher clergy, to whom it was forbidden by the earlier legislation relative to celibacy. Among the Church fathers who tolerated the idea of concubinage when it existed as a monogamic and permanent relation was Augustine. The book must be regarded as a valuable contribution to ethical and ecclesiastical history. It demonstrates, however, how sadly in the earlier centuries Christianity had become interwoven with the views of the world, that concubinage was not at once and totally eradicated.

---

#### RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

**Recent Utterances Relative to the Bible and the Faith.** The theology of continental Europe, as the theology of the Christian world, affirms that between the Bible and the faith there is an intimate connection. But the exact nature of that connection is under discussion among the theologians. To the average observer it does indeed appear as though no reputable theologian is left who asserts the verbal inspiration of the Bible; and yet those who deny such inspiration seem to think that the number of authors who make the writers of the Bible mere "writing machines" is constantly increasing. This, if it be a fact, would not prove that such a theory of the relation between the Inspirer and the inspired is growing in popularity, but only that more of those who hold it are coming forward as defenders of their views. It is, perhaps, not too strong to say that, judged by the continuous stream of literature on the subject, this question is still felt to be the vital one for theology. It is simply the old question of the seat of authority in religion. Rationalism has become history; and one who holds that the seat of religious authority is reason seems to be behind the times. On the other hand, Protestants cannot hold to the Church as the seat of authority, since that destroys the freedom of the individual. The only resource is the Bible. And Protestants are trying to settle the



question in what sense the Bible is the word of God. We analyze, and briefly discuss by way of illustrating the course which thought is pursuing, a few of the more recent lectures and articles on the subject. The first we mention is by "Evangelicus," a Ritschlian. Rejecting as erroneous and dangerous the verbal inspiration theory, he raises the question as to how the Christian can decide between the divine and human in the Bible. To this he replies that there is no external, mechanical means by which we can determine the boundary line. He then lays it down as a principle that all which teaches Christ's truth and breathes Christ's spirit is to be accepted as of divine authority, whether spoken by Christ or not. That is, all the utterances of Scripture are to be brought to the test of Christ. If they are Christlike we bow to them; if not, they are to be rejected. The properly educated Christian conscience is the organ by which this test is made. Though he looked at the question from a different point of view, the answer of "Evangelicus" seems to us to be exactly the answer which Luther rendered. If the distinction between the human and the divine elements in the Bible is to be maintained there must be some criterion of judgment, and we know no better one than this. Christ's was the highest revelation. Whatever contradicts it, in letter or spirit, is not to be held by the Christian. The second view is by Professor Cremer. He also rejects the verbal inspiration theory, but distinctly replaces it by the theory of a divinely wrought enlightenment of the witnesses of Christ's life and work. That the word of these witnesses is filled with the Spirit is owing to the fact that they themselves were filled with the Spirit. It is this fact that gives the Scripture its authority, and which will continue to make it authority for all who in the future shall proclaim the word. Because the word is written by men filled with the Spirit we have the human imperfection and the divine perfection of the Bible, that is, a Bible with limits to its authority. While the theory of "Evangelicus" affords us no doctrine of inspiration that of Cremer gives us no criterion whereby we may determine what is human and what divine. Which is the better test of the authoritativeness of a Scripture passage, the assurance given the Christian conscience by careful thought that it coincides with the teachings of Christ, or the assurance that it is spoken or written by a Spirit-filled man, who may, nevertheless, err? Both theories agree that there is in the Bible a human, and in so far an untrustworthy, element. The only theory that obviates this is that of verbal inspiration; and that plunges us into the difficulty of placing a wholly divine and infallible work in the hands of infallible men for interpretation. Out of this difficulty about the only way would be the theory of an infallible Church and pope to interpret the Bible. The third theory is by P. Kölbinger, director of a theological seminary of the *Unitas Fratrum* in Germany. He recognizes that the old orthodox theory of inspiration is a thing of the past. With the change also has come, in some measure and manner, a corresponding change in the conception of faith and revelation. In discussing the relation of thought to faith he comes to the conclusion that doctrine is not an ingredient but a secondary

product of the Christian faith. On the other hand, faith by its very nature includes cognitions in immediate connection with the primary feelings of Christian faith and its acts of will—cognitions which, although belonging to the realm of concrete representations, are, because of their ethical character, no mere play of phantasy, but a connected, well-defined whole; religious cognitions of an ethical kind, and ethical cognitions of a religious kind. From this it follows that for Christendom there is a normal form of ethical-religious cognition which has not yet been developed into doctrine. This is found in the New Testament writings, and is the product of the peculiar experience of Jesus and the primitive Church in divine things. That these writings are in any especial sense the work of the Holy Spirit rests upon the especial historical relation of their authors to the Christian faith, which made possible, in consequence of the immediate influence of Jesus, the Son of God, the highest purity of their cognition of God. Put in plain and unequivocal language, the director of a theological seminary of the United Brethren of Germany regards the New Testament as the product of the Christian consciousness of the primitive Church. The fourth view is found in a lecture by Professor Samuel Oettli. He finds no fault with the doctrine of the development of the Old Testament history, but with the particular form of it as found in Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Smend he cannot agree. He tests their theory in three decisive points: the religious founding of Israel at the time of Moses, the asserted ethicizing of the conception of God by the prophets, and the continuance and completion of the faith in Jehovah during the exile. He declares that we have not the slightest interest at stake when we allow the employment in revelation of the natural laws of the human mind, and on the other hand asserts that the development of the Israelitish religion was not the constant growth of the human spirit from crude error to purer thought, but the progressive self-manifestation of God in revelation, a divine work of education, wrought on unmanageable material. This is simply the doctrine of accommodation in its usual modern form, and it is, perhaps, the best explanation possible of the facts of the Old Testament considered as a divine revelation. The fifth theory is that which is held by Professor Valetton, and relates to Christ's utterances concerning the Old Testament. His position is essentially that entertained by Meinhold, as recently given in this department of the *Review*, and need not be further described. These views, though not including all varieties of opinion and statement, are fairly representative of the most recent critical utterances on the subject. It will be seen that in one way or another each of these theologians is anxious to appear as the champion of some kind of religious authority for the Bible in matters of faith. We cannot help regarding some of them as exceedingly undesirable champions, even more to be dreaded than deliberate and avowed enemies who can be unmistakably identified as such; for some of their views in our judgment tend to undermine the faith. But it is significant that they still profess to believe in and most vigorously contend for the Bible as the supreme rule of faith and practice.

## SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

Why should there not be further antarctic exploration? Rear Admiral A. H. Markham's discussion of the question, in the April number of the *North American*, appeals both to the scientific and the popular reader. The immense area in the southern hemisphere "immediately surrounding the south pole, extending northward to the antarctic circle, and comprising an area of something like 8,000,000 square miles," is "a region absolutely unknown and undiscovered." The "first attempt at southern exploration," the admiral tells us, was made by Captain James Cook, over a hundred years ago. His commission was to reach a large continent there supposed to exist, which "imaginative map makers and cartographers of the sixteenth century had depicted on their maps covered with mountains, lakes, and rivers." Since then, "Weddell, Ross, and Kristensen have all passed the extreme position attained by Captain Cook, but so far these are the only explorers who have succeeded in crossing the seventieth parallel of south latitude." The first of these wrote "hopefully, a day or two before he reached his extreme southern position, that not a particle of ice was to be seen in any direction; that the weather was mild and serene, and the sea literally covered with birds! This, however, is only another instance of the uncertain and varied conditions of ice and sea in high latitudes at different periods." Ross sailed in September, 1839, having already earned high renown as the discoverer of the north magnetic pole, and for three years struggled to penetrate the southern ice. His success was such that he "had the satisfaction of carrying his clumsy bluff-bowed old ships to latitude seventy-five degrees three minutes in about the longitude of New Zealand." From his highest altitude he saw a series of stupendous peaks stretching eastward, and to the tract he gave the name Victoria Land. Kristensen sailed from Melbourne, September, 28, 1894, crossed the antarctic circle on Christmas Day, and "succeeded in effecting a landing on the great southern continent in the neighborhood of Cape Adare." His company thus "had the extreme gratification and honor of being the first human beings that had ever set foot on Victoria Land." The time is now at hand, says the admiral, for "a prosecution of antarctic research." Geography and geology would be benefited; further knowledge of terrestrial magnetism would seem to make it desirable; and the science of meteorology would be advanced. The words of the Duke of Argyll appear particularly appropriate, at the close of this scholarly and sensible article: "I confess I feel an immense interest in the question of antarctic expedition. I always feel a little shame that civilized man, living on his own little planet—a very small globe—should, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, not yet have explored the whole of this little area; it seems a reproach on the enterprise, civilization, and condition of knowledge of the human race."

THE struggle of "the new crusade of criticism" is now to "revivify the dead past," says Edward Caird, of Balliol College, and to "bring back, in all the distinct lineaments of a living personality," the Christ of the gospels. But such an attempt is deprecated by this Oxford writer in the *New World* for March. Though "the last to underestimate the good of the effort of historical reconstruction to which the new criticism is leading us," yet the writer believes that the modern Christian should regard his religion, "not simply as loyalty to a Master, . . . but as adherence to a living principle which is working in the lives of himself and others." His article is entitled "Christianity and the Historical Christ." David Utter, of Salt Lake City, sounds a note of alarm—though he does not so design it—in his article on "Mormonism To-day." Many Latter Day Saints, he infers, yet "look forward to a time when polygamy shall again be practiced under the sanction of the head of the Church." The reader, in other words, feels that polygamy is only somnolent, rather than dead. Amos Kidder Fiske follows with a paper on "The Unknown Homer of the Hebrews." In age this mysterious writer was "almost contemporaneous with Homer." His work "was broken in pieces and wrought with other material into a composite fabric of perdurable strength," and for twenty-five centuries and more he has been "without name and without personal identity." In an article on "Philosophy and Immortality," A. W. Jackson studies the teaching of Dr. James Martineau on the future life. Both the intellect and the conscience, says Martineau, plead for another existence. William F. and Louisa F. Peirce write on "The Armenian Church," and well say that the recent Turkish atrocities "have revealed a new branch of Christianity" to the world. In his article on "Kant's Influence in Theology," C. C. Everett says that the revolution which the great metaphysician accomplished in theology is "as great as that which he wrought in philosophy." F. C. Lowell follows with a consideration of "God and the Ideal of Man." H. Langford Warren discusses "Dante Rossetti as a Religious Artist," to the advantage of the distinguished painter; and Dr. C. A. Briggs concludes with an article on "Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in its Relation to Church Unity." Dr. Watson's creed, he says, is not such "in any proper sense," since his phrases "do not define the life to live, or the morals to practice." A novel adaptation of ministerial service to the needs of poorer communities is suggested by Dr. Briggs in the proposition that the same preacher serve two or more denominations. "He might minister as an Episcopalian in the morning, as a Presbyterian or Congregationalist in the afternoon, and a Methodist in the evening. Why not? Many could do it and would do it if the way were open in the lower judicatories." Dr. Briggs also defines his own status, in the following pleasant bit of autobiography: "I was ordained by a presbytery as a Presbyterian minister. The supreme judicatory of the body which gave me the external authority to act as a minister has suspended my authority so to act. They took away all the authority they ever gave me. They did it in an unconstitutional and illegal manner. If the case

could be renewed in a competent court their action would be declared null and void. But it stands until overruled. I have no present ministerial authority from any ecclesiastical judicatory. I have authority from Jesus Christ by the internal call. My internal call would doubtless be recognized by more than one denomination, if I should seek recognition and authority. But so long as I abstain from such a course and my suspension is continued my authority from the Church is void. I cannot act as a minister without being disorderly. I cannot say, 'The presbytery made me a minister of Jesus Christ; they took from me only the right to act as a Presbyterian minister. I will now act as a Christian minister.' If they had the authority to make me a Christian minister, they had the authority to unmake me also."

---

THE April number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* opens with an article on "The Paradoxes of Science," by Professor G. Frederick Wright. "The attempted explanations of science," he affirms, "instead of being real solutions of mystery, are merely substitutions of one mystery for another, or, what is more frequently the case, of several mysteries in place of one." The scientific explanations he instances are the theory of gravitation, the atomic constitution of matter, and the mystery of life—the consideration of the latter involving a mention of Spencer's "physiological units," Darwin's "gemmules," Weismann's "biophores," and Minot's "germ plasm." The Rev. E. S. Carr, A.M., contributes a critical article on "Spencer's Philosophy of Religion." A warm appreciation of a standard poem is given by Professor T. W. Hunt, Ph.D., in his paper on "Tennyson's 'In Memoriam.'" There are few readers of the poet, he holds, who, "if compelled to select one of his poems to the exclusion of all others, would not choose the 'In Memoriam' as the most representative single production." Its purpose, he declares, is "an attempt to state and solve the problem of life—as life is inseparably connected with death and destiny and immortality." No poem, says Professor Hunt, "has so permeated and suffused modern English verse." The two following articles, whose titles are sufficiently explanatory, are "The Cosmogony of Genesis, and its Reconcilers," by President Henry Morton, Ph.D., which is to be continued, and "No National Stability without Morality," by President C. W. Super, LL.D. The sixth article, by the Rev. R. De Witt Mallary, D.D., considers the question, "Is the Recognition of the Church Year by all Christians Desirable?" The writer answers in the affirmative, and believes that "the time is coming when all portions of the Church year will be as loyally and universally observed as is the restored festival of Christ's resurrection." Professor Edward Dickinson next considers "The Ideal of Church Music," and Professor J. M. P. Metcalf follows with "The Tell-el-Amarna Letters." His article particularly analyzes the contents of these letters, and is to be continued. A review of Dr. Lyman Abbott's "Christianity and Social Problems" is made by Z. Swift Holbrook. While he finds much to commend in Dr. Abbott's book he pronounces it defective

among other things in his "ethical conception of the value of self compared with neighbor," and in his "definition of socialism." The concluding article, by Professor William Caldwell, M.A., discusses "The Housing Question and Scientific Reform." It constitutes an address read before the Improved Housing Conference at Chicago, in February, 1897. America, says the writer, "of all countries should take the lead" in the reform proposed.

---

In the *Review of Reviews* for March, W. T. Stead, writing of the longest reign in British history, closes his article with this description: "The last occasion on which I saw her majesty was on that high and solemn festival when Queen Victoria summoned to Westminster Abbey the representatives of all the nations, principalities, and powers that own her sway, in order to join with her in rendering thanks to Almighty God for the marvelous loving-kindness and manifold mercies he had graciously vouchsafed to this land of ours during her reign of fifty years. The memory of that stately pageant is with me still. The gray old abbey, with all its associations of genius and of glory, never inclosed within its massive walls a scene more splendid and inspiring. Every nook and corner in the vast edifice was crowded with a great multitude of the picked men of the realm and of the empire. No department of the State, no colony, no dependency, was unrepresented in that brilliant throng. Ambassadors and governors, princes and potentates, dusky oriental rajahs blazing in jewels, English nobles, and the great notables of the democracy mustered in troops to the great thanksgiving. When all were assembled beneath the storied roof of the ancient abbey, and the long aisles framed a marvelous picture of life and color, the queen entered. The whole assemblage rose to their feet as the familiar figure of the mother of her people slowly passed down the nave to take her place before the altar, where in the midst of her children she offered thanks. And as the queen—the highest on earth—knelt before the Lord God of heaven all thought of her majesty and her might, of her empire over land and sea, disappeared, and we saw only the plain little loving-hearted woman who, as maid, wife, and widow, had for fifty years shared more than any all the joys, sorrows, hopes, fears, trying vicissitudes, and glowing aspirations which make up the sum of the private and public life of her people."

---

THE *Christian Quarterly* for April has: "A Nineteenth Century Movement," by J. H. Garrison, in which the writer discusses Christian unity; "Congregational Church Polity," by Rev. M. Burnham; "The Genius of Christianity," by Professor B. A. Hinsdale; "The Socialism of George Eliot," by Rev. G. H. Combs; "The Duke of Argyll and His Work," by J. W. Monser.—The *Gospel in All Lands* for April opens with "Some Reasons Why I Stand by the Cause of Missions," by General J. F. Rusling. Its following articles treat mostly of domestic mission work. The number is most attractive.



## BOOK NOTICES.

## RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

*Letters to the Clergy, on the Lord's Prayer and the Church.* With replies from Clergymen and the Laity, and an Epilogue by Mr. RUSKIN. Edited with essays and comments by the Rev. T. A. MALLESON. 12mo, pp. 332. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.75.

Conversations between Mr. Ruskin and Dr. Malleeson moved the latter to induce the former to write out his views in these letters, and to consent to their being read and discussed in a private clerical society. Later it was decided to print them together with the comments of the clergy on Ruskin's views, followed by an epilogue in which Mr. Ruskin replies to the comments. This third edition, revised and enlarged, revives the book after an interval of twelve years. For relentless frankness in vehement expression Ruskin has no modern match except Carlyle. His lofty ideals cast condemnation everywhere upon actual life and custom in Church and State and society. The editor believes that these letters of an eminent layman, whose field of work lies quite as much in religion and ethics as in art, may help us to divest ourselves of old forms of thought, "to cast off self-indulgent views of our duty as ministers of religion, to lift ourselves out of those grooves in which we are apt to run so smoothly and so complacently, persuading ourselves that all is well just as it is, and to endeavor to strike into a sterner, harder path, beset with difficulties, but still the path of duty." Ruskin thinks the clergy should put the Gospel of Christ into such plain words and short terms that any plain man may understand it. He asks whether a simple explanation of the terms of the Lord's Prayer, in their completeness and life, might not help to make the Gospel plain, adding that in suggesting that the Lord's Prayer be made a foundation of Gospel teaching he did not mean that it contains all that Christian ministers have to teach, but that it contains what all Christians are agreed upon as first to be taught. He thinks zealous ministers should make as much effort to get wicked rich people out of Church as to get wicked poor people converted into it: "The foulest oaths of the thief and the street walker are, in the ears of God, sinless as the hawk's cry or the gnat's murmur, compared to the responses, in the Church service, on the lips of the usurer and the adulterer." He says few religious writings are both upright and intelligible. In offering the Lord's Prayer we are to remember that the first and intensest article of our Father's will is our sanctification; and the Gospel we are to mend the world with is not alone the soft, sweet message of pardon, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father," but also the clear explanation of what the will of the Lord is, and the firm and forcible announcement that men must—absolutely must—set themselves obediently to do that holy will. We are not to encourage iniquity by preaching away the penalties of it. Partly for want of faithful proph-

esying, "the great cities of the earth, which ought to be the places set on its hills, with the temple of the Lord in the midst of them, to which the tribes should go up—centers to the kingdoms and provinces of honor, virtue, and the knowledge of the law of God—have become instead loathsome centers of fornication and covetousness, the smoke of their sin going up into the face of heaven like the furnace of Sodom, and the pollution of it rotting and raging through the bones and the souls of the people round them." Ruskin thinks the clergy nowadays have a hard task to teach people to love their enemies when many of them are devoting their energies to swindling their friends. He remarks upon the grotesque inconsistency of human nature's willingness to be taxed with any quantity of sins in the gross, and its resentment at the insinuation of having committed the smallest parcel of them in detail. He charges that "the whole nature of prayer has been doubted in our hearts and disgraced by our lips; that we are afraid to ask God's blessing on the earth when the scientific people tell us he has made previous arrangements to curse it; and that instead of obeying without fear or debate the plain order, 'Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full,' we sorrowfully sink back into the apology for prayer that 'it is a wholesome exercise, even when fruitless,' and that we ought piously always to suppose that the text really means no more than, 'Ask, and ye shall not receive, that your joy may be empty.'" "In what respect the kingdoms of the world and the glory of *them* differ from the kingdom, the power, and the glory which are God's forever, is seldom intelligibly explained from the pulpit; still less the irreconcilable hostility between the two royalties and realms asserted in its sternness of decision." "The Society of Jesuits is a splendid proof of the power of obedience, but its curse is falsehood. . . . We (of the St. George's Company) are their precise opposites—fiercely and at all costs frank, while they are calmly and for all interests lying." Ruskin writes to Malleson, "It takes me as long to write a chapter as you to write a book, and tires me more to do it, so that I am sick of the feel of a pen this many a day." A strong hint for parents, pastors, and teachers is, in his opinion, that one mistake made by good people is in spending so much effort in trying to pull fallen people up, and so little in keeping yet safe ones from tumbling, and spending their pains on the worst instead of the best material. "If they want to be able to save the lost like Christ let them first be sure they can say with him, 'Of those thou gavest me I have lost none.'" We must make our congregations understand that "God is a living God, not a dead law; and that he is a reigning God, putting wrong things to rights, and that, sooner or later, with a strong hand and a rod of iron, and not at all with a soft sponge and warm water, washing everybody as clean as a baby every Sunday morning, whatever dirty work they have been about all the week." For thirty years Ruskin used to read the Liturgy of the English Church through to his servant and himself if there was no Protestant service to go to in Alpine or Italian villages; but as he has grown older he has become "more and more suspicious of the effect of that particular form

of words on the truthfulness of the English mind." He says that Oxford University is now so ashamed of that code of prayer "that it no more dares compel its youth so much as to hear, much less to utter it." Comparing that service with the earlier rituals of worship from which it was derived, he wonders that the Church of England should have "cast out from beginning to end all the intensely spiritual and passionate utterances," and in what it did preserve of those earlier, stronger, and deeper forms should have "mangled or blunted them down to the exact degree which would make them either unintelligible or inoffensive—so vague that everybody might use them or so pointless that nobody could be offended by them." This loyal layman of the Church of England, writing of its Liturgy, says that its first address to the congregation before the Almighty is "precisely the fault-fullest and foolishlest piece of English language" that he knows of "in the whole compass of English or American literature." "In the seventeen lines of it there are seven times over two words for one idea: acknowledge and confess, sins and wickedness, dissemble nor cloke, goodness and mercy, assemble and meet, requisite and necessary, pray and beseech." He says that in these days one almost wonders whether there ever was such a thing as discipline in the Christian Church, and that the pettifogging piety of England has not now the courage either to deny grace to a wicked duke in its Church nor to declare Christ's grace in its Parliament. John Ruskin says he sat under the preaching of Charles H. Spurgeon with much edification for a year or two. "A clergyman should ever be so truly the friend of his parishioners as to deserve their confidence from the children upward." This, which Ruskin writes of himself, all men believe to be true: "No man more than I has ever loved the places where God's honor dwells, or yielded truer allegiance to the teaching of his evident servants." He adds that no man grieves more over the danger of the Church to-day as "she whispers procrastinating *pax vobiscum* in answer to the spurious kiss of those who would fain toll curfew over the last fires of English faith." Recovering from an illness accompanied with mental derangement, he writes to Dr. Malleon: "It will be many a day before I recover yet—if ever—but with caution I hope not to go wild again, and to get what power belongs to my age slowly back. Let me strongly warn you from the whirlpool's edge—the going down in the middle is gloomier than I can tell you." "In divinity matters I am obliged to stop. I am almost struck mad when I think earnestly about them, and I'm only reading natural history or nature now." "I am very thankful to find in my own case that a quiet spring of energy filters back into the old wellheads—if one does not bucket it out as fast as it comes in." The editor thinks that Ruskin's letters "present a truly lifelike picture of their writer with his shrewd common sense and deeper wisdom, enlivened in no small measure by a quick impulsiveness which is sometimes rather startling." Miss Susanna Beever, to whom Ruskin dedicated *Frondes Agrestes*, writes of these letters: "They are like the 'foam globes of heaven,' and have exercised my mind very much. Things in

them which at first seemed rather startling prove, on closer examination, to be full of deep truth. The suggestions in them lead to 'great searchings of heart.' Canon Farrar declined, when requested, to discuss Ruskin's letters, saying, "I am too painfully overwhelmed with the very duties which Mr. Ruskin seems to think that we don't do—looking after the material and religious interest of the sick, the suffering, the hungry, the drunken, and the extremely wretched."

*Guesses at the Riddle of Existence, and Other Essays on Kindred Subjects.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. 12mo, pp. 244. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book does not impress us as important. Dealing with some of the same problems, it is distinctly inferior to W. R. Greg's *Enigmas of Life*, published some twenty years ago. The first of five essays gives the book its title; the other four are: "The Church and the Old Testament," "Is There Another Life?" "The Miraculous Element in Christianity," "Morality and Theism." The preface says that the spirit of the book is not that of agnosticism, but of free and hopeful inquiry. The author wishes to assist in clearing away the wreck of discredited beliefs in order to make way for new ones which may be invented or derived. He repeats the truism that "to resign untenable arguments for a belief is not to resign the belief, while a belief bound up with untenable arguments will share their fate;" true, only it needs to be said that a belief may be sound when the arguments used to support it are unwise or insufficient, as a judge's decision may be right when the reasons he gives for it are not sufficient; and a belief which has been advocated with false arguments may be susceptible of a new and better defense. He says that where his conclusion sare, or seem to be, negative, he will rejoice to "see the more welcome view reasserted and fresh evidence of its truth supplied;" which seems to be a confession that his views are not pleasant to himself, and that as he progresses in unbelief his happiness is diminished. So it shall always be; the Gospel is glad tidings, and whatever discredits or doubts it is sad, dismal, forlorn tidings, bringing nothing but heaviness to the heart of man. The first essay discusses rather adversely the books of Mr. Drummond, Mr. Kidd, and Mr. Balfour. It says that Drummond's solution is incomplete; Kidd overstates his case; and Balfour's method reacts dangerously upon himself. Looking on while Balfour's flashing blade disposes of naturalism on the one hand, and of transcendentalism on the other, the author says that the idea of driving the world back to faith through general skepticism is delusive. "Universal skepticism is more likely to be the ultimate result, and any faith which is not spontaneous, whether it be begotten of ecclesiastical pressure or intellectual despair, is, and in the end will show itself to be, merely veiled unbelief. The catastrophe of Dean Mansell, who, while he was trying, in the interest of orthodoxy, to cut the ground from under the feet of the rationalist, himself inadvertently demonstrated the impossibility of believing in God, was an awful warning to the polemical tactician." According to the author, various fondly cherished arguments, beliefs, institutions are in a damaged condition; and yet something remains. He thinks the old argument from design is

damaged, because "we have nothing with which to compare this world, and therefore cannot tell whether it was possible for it to be other than it is." Startling news, indeed, but known as well to the framers of the old argument as to Goldwin Smith. He thinks the Church survives chiefly on its value "as a social center and a reputed safeguard of social order." Evidently he knows no more about the Church and what is really going on therein, the mighty works being done in it, through it, and by it, than a street Arab out on the sidewalk knows of the interior of Westminster Abbey. He concedes that Butler's *Analogy*, "though in partial ruin, is still great." He remarks that "evolution, which is not a power, but a method," is personified and almost deified by its exponents. He says that the fact that science has apparently disclosed the corporeal origin and relations of our mental faculties, and of "what theology calls the soul," has altered the character of the question as to a life beyond the present. He tries to comfort us by saying that "if revelation is lost, manifestation still remains, and great manifestations appear to be opening on our view." And when, groping around in the dark without any Bible, we inquire of the men who stole it from us where we shall look for those "great manifestations," we are told that the universe and humanity are manifestations, and we are simply to sit down before them and study them and wait for the light to break, like expectant spectators at a spiritualistic seance, sitting with the lights out and waiting for the spirits to materialize. We prefer to go to church and hear from the dear old Bible the cheerful Gospel of Him who alone is the light of the world. Second in this book is that wretched essay in which the Old Testament is described as a millstone about the neck of Christianity. It will take more than the opinions of the Canon of Manchester, which are quoted as a text, to make such an essay respectable. The author's entire attitude toward the Old Testament is fairly indicated by his question, "Why should we force ourselves to believe that a Being who fills eternity and infinity became the guest of a Hebrew sheikh?" That sort of objection tells equally against the incarnation and all spiritual visitations from God to man, and as certainly disposes of the New Testament as it does of the Old. We do not see why a man who reasons after such a fashion should waste his time in discussing Christianity or even religion as if either of them were a live issue or had any shadow of footing in the realm of reality. We cannot help having two opinions: first, that unwarranted liberties are being taken with the Old Testament, and unnecessary surrenders made by some whose business it is to defend it; second, that there is an excessive amount of groaning over, or under, the Old Testament. In response to critical attacks one man replies, "Christianity is not responsible for the Old Testament." Another, as if well-nigh overwhelmed with uncertainty, says, "If it were not for Jesus Christ I would be an agnostic." But another feels secure in standing by the Old Testament, and says, "If I could not be a Christian I would be a Jew; if the divine Christ were taken from me I would still submit myself to Moses and the Old Testament for the fullest knowledge of God

and the best spiritual guidance given to man." How can any man suppose it possible to cut the Bible in two and then keep Christianity alive, to throw away the Old Testament and expect to keep the New Testament? How long did Chang live after Eng died? One twin may survive the other, but not if they are Siamese twins bound together in a vascular and vital unity. The third essay is called out by and discusses Dr. Salmond's volume, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, which we noticed in our last issue. We agree with the statement on page 128 that if death is to end all alike for the righteous and for the unrighteous, the Power that rules the universe cannot be just in any sense of the word which we can understand. The fourth essay contains matter which we could quote with approval, as, for example, "The effect produced by the teaching of Jesus and his disciples is, beyond question, the most momentous fact in history." This also from *Supernatural Religion*: "The teaching of Jesus carried morality to the sublimest point attained or even attainable by humanity. The influence of his spiritual religion has been rendered doubly great by the unparalleled purity and elevation of his own character. . . . He presented the spectacle of a life uniformly noble and consistent with his own lofty principles, so that the 'imitation of Christ' has become almost the final word in the preaching of his religion." His moral teaching was "final in this respect, amongst others, that, superseding codes of law and elaborate rules of life, it confined itself to two fundamental principles—love to God and love to man. While all previous systems had merely sought to purify the stream it demanded the purification of the fountain. It placed the evil thought on a par with the evil action. Such morality, based upon the intelligent and earnest acceptance of divine law, and perfect recognition of the brotherhood of man, is the highest conceivable by humanity, and although its power and influence must augment with the increase of enlightenment, it is itself beyond development, consisting as it does of principles unlimited in their range and inexhaustible in their application." Christianity is alone in preaching its Gospel to the whole world, in its adaptation to the whole world, and in its display of recuperative power; "no parallel to the revivals of Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley is presented by any other religion." "Moral civilization and sustained progress have been thus far limited to Christendom." "Wherever there is a law there must be a lawgiver, and the lawgiver must be presumed capable of suspending the operation of law. This Hume himself would hardly have denied." "In fact, the metaphysical argument against miracles comes pretty much to this, that a miracle cannot take place, because if it did it would be a miracle. We could not help believing our own senses if we actually saw a man raised from the dead. There is no reason why we should not believe the testimony of other people, provided that they were eyewitnesses, that they were competent in character and in intelligence, and that their testimony had been submitted to impartial and thorough investigation." "Faith is a belief, not in things unproved, but in things unseen." "Pessimism is the reverie of disappointment and satiety, with



an infusion of Byronic sentiment and of the melancholy of Schopenhauer and Leopardi." "Science and religion, even the most fervent religion, have been able to dwell together in the intellects of Newton and Faraday." Goldwin Smith's book will not be pleasing to the gentlemen who are playing fast and loose with the supernatural in the Bible, trying at once to let go and to hold on, claiming to be still Christian while surrendering a large part of the miraculous, because this book tells them they cannot succeed. Such books visibly annoy them.

*Immortality and the New Theodicy.* By GEORGE A. GORDON, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. 16mo, pp. 130. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, gilt top, \$1.

This book is a philosopher's venture at the truth. Its author, it is true, finds himself unable "to reason as if Christianity had never been," or to enter the field of discussion in any other relation than that of a religious teacher. Yet he aims to conduct his inquiry "purely upon rational grounds," and therefore considers it "inadmissible to introduce into the argument the ultimate basis of Christian belief in the future life, the resurrection of Christ." The term "theodicy" he regards as a pivotal word in the attempt which he makes "to carry the question of the immortality of man to the moral conception of the universe for determination." Some of his earlier chapters, upon which we may not linger, are entitled, "The Evidence for the Denial," "Value of the Evidence for Denial," "Postulates of Immortality," and "Illogical Limitations," such limitations being the "theories of the remnant, election, or probation." Dr. Gordon, having discussed these topics as preliminary to his positive argument, then finds his central proof for immortality in the doctrine of evolution. One sentence will show his logic: "When man's ethical nature is reached, and where so much room and material for development exist, it would seem to be not a violent inference from evolution to suppose that this world is but the first stage in the moral discipline of the race." His argument, in other words, from this point through the concluding chapters turns on the truth of evolution. Many, however, will feel that he makes too much of this experimental theory, and, in a vigorous protest yet cherished against evolution, will contend that the philosopher puts to sea in an untried boat. Yet Dr. Gordon's book is able and thought-provoking.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

*The English Novel. A Study in the Development of Personality.* By SIDNEY LANIER. Revised Edition. Crown 8vo, pp. 302. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, \$3.

A rare and well-developed personality was Sidney Lanier, and his own fine quality pervades this penetrative study. These twelve chapters were lectures delivered in Johns Hopkins University in 1881. They were almost his last work, done with shortening breath, rapid pulse, and burning brain. George Eliot's death occurring in the middle of the course led the lecturer to devote six lectures to her work. A coldly crit-

ical attitude toward the writings of Lanier is difficult, if not impossible, to one who knows the man—his exquisitely delicate sensibility, his gallant and heroic spirit, his high-pitched endeavor, his valiant fight in a losing battle for bread and for life. His history so awakens admiring sympathy that all men are moved to treat him tenderly. But his work stands strong on its merits, and asks no compassion or forbearance from the critics. There is enough of splendid vigor, of keen insight, of beauty and sweetness, of elevation and power, to mark his genius as genuine, unique, original. There is, too, remarkable poise, for so passionate and ecstatic a nature. It is no weakling and no tyro who traces in this volume the growth of human personality from Æschylus, through Plato, Socrates, and the contemporary Greek mind—through the *Renaissance*, Shakespeare, Richardson, and Fielding down to Dickens and George Eliot; and who insists that it is the unfolding of personality since the time of Æschylus which has wrought those stupendous changes in the relation of man to God, to physical nature, and to his fellow, that have culminated in the modern cultus. Lanier speaks of Tennyson's "De Profundis—Two Greetings," addressed to a newborn child, as "a very noble and rapturous hymn to the great Personality above us, acknowledging the mystery of our own personalities as finitely dependent upon, and yet so infinitely divided from, his Personality." He combats three erroneous notions: (1) that science will destroy all poetry and imaginative work generally; (2) that science will simply destroy the old imaginative products and build up a new formless sort of imaginative product (like Whitman's) in its stead; (3) that science will absorb into itself all imaginative effort so that poems and novels will be merely the plain unvarnished record of a scientific experiment in passion. He speaks of Zola as "defiling the whole earth and slandering all humanity under the sacred names of 'naturalism,' of 'science,' of 'physiology.'" Pleading for the necessity and sacredness of forms, he defines "Religion as the aspiration toward unknown forms and the unknown Form-giver." He protests against the Whitmanish literature which wears a slouch hat, and has its shirt open at the bosom, and generally riots in a complete independence of form; and against "a poetry which has painted a great scrawling picture of the human body, and has written under it, '*This is the soul*,' which shouts a profession of religion in every line, but of a religion that, when examined, reveals no tenet, no rubric, save that a man must be natural, must abandon himself to every passion; and which constantly roars its belief in God, but with a camarado air as if it were patting the Deity on the back and bidding him cheer up and hope for further encouragement." Walt Whitman seems to Lanier "the most stupendously mistaken man in all history as to what constitutes true democracy." "A republic is the government of the spirit; a republic depends on the self-control of each member; you cannot make a republic out of muscles and prairies and Rocky Mountains; republics are made of the spirit." "My democrat, the democrat whom I contemplate with pleasure, the democrat who is to write or to read the poetry of the

future, may have a mere thread for his biceps, yet he shall be strong enough to handle hell, he shall play ball with the earth; and albeit his stature may be no more than a boy's, he shall still be taller than the great redwoods of California; his height shall be the height of great resolution and love and faith and beauty and knowledge and subtle meditation; his head shall be forever among the stars." We like to see Lanier pit himself against Whitman; it is the fair play of beauty against the beast. The "Prometheus Bound" of Æschylus emphasizes physical rather than spiritual pain, and displays a feeble sense of personality. Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound" fails because the attempt to reproduce upon a modern audience the old terrors of thunder and lightning which were suitable and effective for Æschylus is absurd. We moderns are not moved by the turning of the thundermill behind the scenes, for "we have seen a man (not a Titan nor a god), one of ourselves, go forth into a thunderstorm and send his kite up into the very bosom thereof and fairly entice the lightning by his wit to come and perch upon his finger and be the tame bird of him and his fellows thereafter and forever." Plato's *Republic* shows a lack of the sense of personality, and Aristotle a lack of intellectual conscience. Love of truth is a modern characteristic. Modern science dates from Newton; modern music from Bach and Handel. Love is the modern watchword; love, and not justice, is the organic power of moral order. Marian Evans, from being a strong Calvinist, reacted to skepticism, and during her first five years in London translated Spinoza's *Ethics*, Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity*, and Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, and studied physics, Comtism, and the like among the London agnostics. Lanier regards it as mournful that on coming to London she fell among a group of persons represented by George Henry Lewes, and says that "if one could have been her spiritual physician at that time one would certainly have prescribed for her some of those warm influences which dissipate doubt by exposing it to the fierce elemental heats of love, of active charity. . . . Or one might have prescribed for her America, where the knottiest social and moral problems disappear unaccountably before a certain new energy of individual growth which is continually conquering new points of view from which to regard the world." He says there is "more religion in George Eliot's works than she herself dreamed she was putting there, and a clearer faith for us than she even formulated for herself." He declares that in modern fiction she is supreme in portraying spiritual regeneration. Once she said to a friend, "What I look to is a time when the impulse to help our fellows shall be as immediate and as irresistible as that which I feel to grasp something firm if I am falling;" and at the word she clutched the mantel-piece as if actually saving herself from falling, with an intensity which made the gesture eloquent. Here is one of her keen glimpses into one of the curious whims of personality: "The impulse to confession almost always requires the presence of a fresh ear and a fresh heart; and in our moments of spiritual need the man to whom we have no tie but our common nature seems nearer to us than mother, brother, or friend. Our

daily familiar life is but a hiding of ourselves from each other behind a screen of trivial words and deeds, and those who sit with us at the same hearth are often the farthest off from the deep human soul within us, full of unspoken evil and unacted good." Referring to George Eliot's quiet humor, he speaks of "that eye-twinkle between the lines which makes much of her ruggedest writing like a Virginia fence from between whose rails peep wild roses and morning-glories." Here is a wholesome thought: "All reasoning and all experience show that if you confront a man day by day with nothing but a picture of his own unworthiness the final effect is, not to stimulate but to paralyze his moral energy." This is Lanier's feeling about the beautiful character of Dinah Morris, the Methodist in *Adam Bede*: "Solemn, fragile, strong Dinah Morris, the woman preacher whom I find haunting my imagination in strange but entrancing unions of the most diverse forms, as if, for instance, a snow-drop could also be St. Paul, as if a kiss could be a gospel, as if a lovely phrase of Chopin's most inward music should suddenly become an Apocalypse revealing to us Christ in the flesh—that rare, pure, and marvelous Dinah Morris who would alone consecrate English literature if it had yielded no other gift to man." He thinks a clear proof of the modernness of personality is in the fact of our complete ignorance as to the physical person of Christ. "One asks oneself how comes it never to have occurred to Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John to tell us what manner of man this was—what stature, what complexion, what color of eyes and hair, what shape of hand and foot. A natural instinct arising at the very outset of the descriptive effort would have caused a modern to acquaint us with these and many like particulars." Lanier says that nowadays men do not want you to tell them how many times a day they shall pray, or to prescribe how many inches wide shall be the hem of their garment. "Christ, the Master, never did this; too well he knew the growth of personality which would settle these matters, each for itself; too well he knew the subtle hurt of all such violations of individualism." He evidently thinks it wise not to attempt to teach the world with a rule and a square, but rather to give men for their guidance those widely applicable principles and "those prodigious generalizations in which the Master's philosophy, considered purely as a philosophy, surely excelled all other systems."

*Evil and Evolution.* By the Author of *The Social Horizon*. 12mo, pp. 184. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book, which is reported from London to be one of the best-selling books of the hour, is, the author says, an attempt to turn the light of modern science on to the ancient mystery of evil. He makes no appeal to the Bible, but says that no inference is to be made concerning his opinion of the Scriptures. He thinks we have very much the same ground for belief in a devil as for belief in a God, and that the simplest and most satisfactory solution of the riddle of all the ages "is just the old one—that the Supreme Ruler, in his beneficent activity in the universe, is confronted by another power; that in the absolute literal sense

of the word God is not omnipotent; that he is engaged in a conflict which to a certain extent limits his power, and the final issue of which can be wrought out only in the course of ages. In plain terms, there is a God and there is a devil, and the two powers are in conflict. The Idea is as old as humanity, and, as a scientific hypothesis, it is, in a certain sense, at least, simple and intelligible, and not only may it be made to fit in with evolution, but it has the merit of explaining more of the phenomena of the moral and the physical world around us than any other conceivable one." The chapters treat of "Some Theories of the Purpose of Evil," "The Fatherly Education Theory," "The Evolutionary Explanation of Evil," "Satan from a Scientific Point of View," "Natural Laws and Human Laws," "The Limits of Necessary Suffering," "How 'Maladjustments' Originated," "The Type of a Perfect Life," "Is not 'Maladjustment' Essential to Evolution?" "Eat and Be Eaten," "Red in Tooth and Claw' not Necessarily Evil," "The Greatest of all Maladjustments," "Evolution Without Maladjustment," "What Might Have Been." About the temptation and fall of man the author reasons that we cannot conceive of a point where the astutest Satanic malignity, bent on making the very laws of a benign Creator work out death and destruction, could act more effectively than just at the point where, in the slow unfolding of life, love and selfishness first came into conflict. "Assume that just there a malignant power effected a disturbance of the natural laws under which things were unfolding, and you have a theory which accounts intelligibly for every phase and form of the world's moral and social evil, while you have the character of the Creator purely benevolent. There is no other theory that will do it." An Episcopalian preacher said to his congregation, "If we were not so self-conceited we would be more willing to believe in the existence of the devil and other evil spirits, as well as in good spirits. It is enormous egotism to look on the universe and imagine there is no one here but ourselves." Upon this volume Dr. A. B. Leonard comments thus: "The Bible theory of the introduction of sin and its final outcome is far more satisfactory than any scheme evolution has been able to devise. This book indicates that men of science are slowly, though reluctantly, coming round to the doctrines of evil and salvation set forth in the Bible. Moses tells us how sin got into the world, and Jesus Christ is the only way of deliverance." On page 163 is quoted the critical Frenchman's description of an Englishman's idea of a holiday: "We've got a holiday to-day; let's go out and kill something."

---

#### HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

*The Historic Episcopate.* A Study of Anglican Claims and Methodist Orders. By R. J. COOKE, D.D., Professor of Evangelical and Historical Theology. 12mo, pp. 221. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. Price, cloth, \$1.

To the student of ecclesiastical affairs it has become an accepted fact that the Romanizing teachings of the Tractarians, once condemned, have

now in large measure become the dominant teachings in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church. Prominent above all other dogmas advocated by this High Church element, and one upon which excessive emphasis is placed, is the doctrine of episcopal succession in direct unbroken series from the Apostolic College. The claim made to this succession by the Established Church has been as often denied as it has been affirmed by Protestant and Roman and Greek Churches. Nevertheless, the claim is still persisted in, and divers efforts are made to bring about a recognition of the validity of English orders. The gradual approach in recent years of the Anglican Church to the Roman Church caused many to entertain the hope that if the question was reopened the Roman Church, under Leo XIII, might be induced to decree the validity of these orders on various grounds, and thus pave the way for ultimate union with Rome. To this end the Church Union, a society in England including some noble names and many ecclesiastical dignitaries eminent for learning and devotion, exerted its full strength. Leading divines in various parts of the kingdom, aided by others in the United States, lent their abilities to the cause; Roman Catholic scholars and ecclesiastics in France gave their assistance; the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was started; influential Church journals became organs of the party or recorded their doings; and, as if the claim were already established and recognition of it decreed, the bishops of the Established Church declared that an essential condition of union of other Churches with that Church was an acceptance of the historic episcopate.

The work before us, by Dr. Cooke, was occasioned by these events. It is a protest, based on history, against these claims, and so thoroughly fortified does his position seem that the author is confident that while minor statements and inductions may be challenged, the argument as a whole will never be refuted. This is a bold stand to take, but the decision of the Roman court after prolonged research and study of the question through special experts, based on the same line of investigation as that pursued by our author, seems to give good ground for his confidence in his results. As a matter of fact, the advocates of Anglican claims cannot overthrow his conclusions without at the same time overthrowing the decisions of the special Roman commission that studied the case. The author in the pursuit of his purpose assumes Anglican principles and then applies these to Anglican claims. His method is critically historical, and every step of the way is contested with perfect knowledge of the situation without any attempt to force the facts of history to harmonize with his contention. Hence he traverses as a foundation the history of the formative period of the Established Church at the Reformation, examines authoritative sources for the opinions and beliefs of the English reformers and leaders of the Church at that time, shows from historical documents, contemporary historians, reformers, and the general opinion of the period what was the actual belief of the English Church relative to the doctrine which is now so strenuously insisted upon by Anglicans as having always been the doctrine of the Church of England. The



work will awaken much opposition, and we shall not be surprised to hear of replies from many quarters. So much has been written by special pleaders in defense of Anglican orders, so thoroughly satisfied have Anglican ministers become that the ministerial orders of other Churches are null and void, and so confident have they been that Episcopal Methodism is wholly void of legitimate authority that this uncompromising challenge and disproof of the validity of English orders, on Anglican principles, from a Methodist minister, which disproof is sustained by representative religious journals, must mark a new era in the history of the discussion which has already existed too long and should now be laid aside forever. In the author's discussion of Methodist orders many things are suggested to students of Methodist history and polity that may perhaps give us pause in our study of the basis of Methodist episcopacy. This part of the work is worthy of the closest thought, as is every chapter of the book, and he who masters the entire argument will have nothing to fear from the unhistorical and exclusive claims of High Church advocates. The foundation of Methodist orders is set forth by showing that in ordaining Dr. Coke Mr. Wesley appealed for his authority to Holy Scripture, to the practice of the primitive Church, to the call of the Church, and to the necessity of the circumstances. While reviewing Dr. Cooke's book and writing this notice we received from Longmans, Green & Co., of New York, a pamphlet of forty-eight pages containing the answer of the archbishops of England to the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII on English ordinations. It will be remembered that the pope, having been invited to investigate the validity of Anglican orders, in publishing his decision, based on the report of the Roman commission, by which a minute and thorough examination had been made, turned his verdict against the claims of the Anglican body, not so much on the historic question as to whether Parker and his successors were in fact consecrated, but more on the question whether the grace of holy orders was conveyed by the rite used in the ordination of priests and consecration of bishops for the first hundred years after the Reformation. The Roman court declared that the form used, commonly known as the Edwardine ordinal, was not sufficient, and further that it was not the mind or intention of the Reformation divines to convey the full grace of holy orders. Therefore the pope has decided that the Reformation ordinations were invalid, and that the grace of orders and the presence of the Holy Spirit does not abide with the ministry of the Anglican communion. Not until the recent apostolic letter of Leo XIII was the Anglican body ever able to find out why reordination was insisted on in the case of Anglican priests passing over into the Roman Church. Now it is officially stated by the Roman pontiff what is the matter with Anglican orders. The English archbishops in their reply declare that the pope in overthrowing their orders overthrows his own and entirely destroys the foundations of his own Church, and endeavor to show that while the ordination forms were changed, as is affirmed by the pope, they were not so altered as to invalidate the ordination, but were essentially regular and quite

sufficient, and that in the very forms used by the fathers of the English Church in making and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons it is certainly implied and manifest that they intended to continue those offices in the same sense in which they had received them. The English archbishops, near the close of the pamphlet now lying before us, and defending the correctness of their form, say: "We therefore make reply that in the ordaining of priests we do duly lay down and set forth the stewardship and ministry of the word and sacraments, the power of remitting and retaining sins, and other functions of the pastoral office, and that in these we do sum up and rehearse all other functions." We doubt if the reply of the English archbishops will be regarded anywhere outside their own communion as successfully disposing of the adverse decision reached by the Roman court through a searching and scholarly investigation of the facts. In this whole discussion both sides contribute to make the Methodist Church more completely satisfied with the validity of its own episcopacy and ministerial orders, so ably explained and amply vindicated in Dr. Cooke's volume.

*Lectures Q. C. Lamar: his Life, Times, and Speeches. 1825-1863.* By EDWARD MAYES, LL.D., Ex-Chancellor of the University of Mississippi. Royal 8vo, pp. 830. Nashville, Tenn.: Barbee & Smith. Price, cloth, \$5.

This is a book of positive value, but is handicapped by one striking defect. Its mechanical form is unfortunate, and is not calculated to please the owners of ordinary bookshelves. So bulky a volume must destroy the symmetry of any well-conditioned library; its unusual size and shape preclude it from consorting with other books of its class and relegate it to a place with the largest dictionaries and cyclopedias, where it is manifestly out of its proper environment. It should, by every law of taste and convenience, have been published in two conventional octavo volumes, omitting matter enough, if necessary, to bring them within an orthodox compass. We are tempted to think that the publishers have committed the unpardonable sin in bookmaking. We incline, however, to overlook the fact that the style is occasionally infelicitous, prolix, and digressive, and we welcome the book, with all its possible faults of form and manner. For the author is singularly happy in his subject. Lamar long held an eminent position in our politics; and the life of one who was for seven years a representative in Congress, was prominent as a soldier and diplomat on the Confederate side during the civil war, was for two full terms a United States senator, for a whole administration Secretary of the Interior, and who died an associate justice of the national Supreme Court is well worthy of competent record. It is, however, as one of the best specimens of the men of the "New South" that Lamar particularly interests us; and Chancellor Mayes has done an important service to the North as well as the South in bringing together so many of the speeches that at the time they were delivered created so profound an impression throughout the entire country. His point of view is essentially Southern and Democratic. It could not well be otherwise; indeed, any other view would have been open to constructions of undue prejudice

and unfairness. But the war is over—never more so than to-day; and the book, even with all its relics of the past, is an important contribution to the literature of the new era. On the death of Charles Sumner, in 1874, Lamar seconded, in a remarkable speech, the resolution that the House adjourn in honor of the dead statesman's memory. Let us quote from this speech a few of the sentences which most honor Sumner's memory, and which honor no less the memory of him who characterized so graciously and justly the career of a noble and fallen political antagonist: "Charles Sumner was born with an instinctive love of freedom, and was educated from his earliest infancy to the belief that freedom is the natural and indefeasible right of every intelligent being having the outward form of man. . . . To a man thoroughly permeated and imbued with such a creed, and animated and constantly actuated by such a spirit of devotion, to behold a human being or a race of human beings restrained of their natural right to liberty, for no crime by him or them committed, was to feel all the belligerent instincts of his nature roused to combat. The fact was to him a wrong which no logic could justify. It mattered not how humble in the scale of rational existence the subject of this restraint might be, how dark his skin, or how dense his ignorance. Behind all that lay for him the great principle that liberty is the birthright of all humanity, and that every individual of every race who has a soul to save is entitled to the freedom which may enable him to work out his salvation. . . . In this fiery zeal and this earnest warfare against the wrong, as he viewed it, there entered no enduring personal animosity toward the men whose lot it was to be born to the system which he denounced. . . . Would that the spirit of the illustrious dead could speak from the grave to both parties to this deplorable discord in tones which should reach each and every heart throughout this broad territory, 'My countrymen, know one another, and you will love one another.'" These were noble words from a Southern voice in 1874, and are pertinent at the present time. We commend the book to all students of our political history.

*Christian Life in Germany.* By EDWARD F. WILLIAMS, D.D. 12mo, pp. 320. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.

The Western editor of the *Congregationalist*, having made a personal study in Germany of the real condition of the Protestant Churches of that country, presents us in this book with the result. The Preface says: "Great Britain and America owe a debt of gratitude to Germany for the literature she has furnished their people, for the contributions she has made to Christian song, and for her devotion to higher Christian learning. In the attention given to the results of special studies, particularly to the results of the so-called higher criticism, both countries are in danger of overlooking equally important contributions in Christian work. Few people, either in Great Britain or America, realize the extent and importance of the foreign missionary work which the German Churches are carrying on, or of that still more wonderful home work which is embraced under the general term Inner Mission." The plan of the book is

fourfold: "First, to describe some of the methods by which the German people are trained for their duties in Church and State, and to show how the character of the government, the military and aristocratic spirit of the nation, affect Christian activity; second, to furnish material for determining the actual condition of the spiritual life of the national Churches by setting forth in some detail what their members are doing, through foreign missions for the world at large, and through the Inner Mission for the needy at home; third, to describe the forces, and their training, by which this home work is carried on; and, finally, to sketch the social and moral conditions of the country and to point out their effect on Christian life and upon the influence of the Church from the year 1860 or from the time when William I became a prominent figure in Prussian politics, to the latest accessible data under his grandson, William II." The above indicates the scope of the work. We have only space to say that the book is comprehensive and gives evidence of thorough study and faithful report of its subject. We quote a few sentences upon a point of practical interest: "The assertion is often made that the Church in Germany is destitute of spiritual life. The assertion rests on the assumption that higher criticism, whose results are published almost as soon as they are reached, is fatal to piety. . . . The works of the critics are read only by a few; and as every position taken by them is immediately subjected to the severest tests as soon as made known, with little prospect of ultimate acceptance, they are in general regarded by the rank and file of professed Christians with something like indifference." "In the universities the religious condition is better than it was twenty years ago. Belief in a revealed religion is not diminishing among educated men. Higher criticism has not destroyed confidence in the Scriptures as the word of God. Nor has it diminished the sense of personal responsibility for the spread of the knowledge of Christ over the world and among those at home whose condition is almost as deplorable as that of unbelievers in heathen lands." "The doctrines of the New Testament were never so popular among the people as now; the Church, including both pastors and laymen, was never more aggressive than now, or more confident that the principles of Christ will everywhere finally prevail." In Berlin the churches are usually full in the morning; the evening attendance is scant, although some preachers attract large audiences at both services. "The more popular preachers are, with few exceptions, strictly evangelical in their belief. The people seem to want to hear an orthodox gospel and to care little for essays or doctrinal discussions."

*Bible Lands Illustrated*—Syria, Palestine, Egypt. By Professor WILLIAM W. MARTIN. Size, 8x10 $\frac{1}{4}$  inches, pp. 342. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, \$2.

This is a handsome volume, printed on enameled paper, with gilt edges, containing about two hundred and fifty illustrations. If sent by mail thirty-five cents additional is required for postage. The author, who is well known to the readers of the *Review*, spent two years in Palestine, holding a position in the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, Syria, traveling much. The book is arranged in the order of a tour from North to

South, beginning with Asia Minor and coming down into the country from Laodicea and Tripoli. There are eleven views of Baalbec and its huge ruins, thirteen of Damascus, and thirty-seven of Jerusalem. The concise letter-press descriptions of the scenes indulge in nothing superfluous, but have a succinct completeness. The pictures chiefly fill the space and make the interest of the book. The carefully chosen views are photographic and lifelike. Here on page 23 is the mountain village of Zahleh, lying in the bowl of surrounding vineclad hills, where Gerald Dale, of Philadelphia, labored for the love of Christ, and men lived the beautiful evangel of his life, and died all too soon. Here is a group of Bedouins who remind us of the guard which escorted us from Mar Saba down to the Dead Sea, through the Jordan valley to Jericho, and up to Jerusalem. Here on page 131 is a view of Nazareth from the south-east, in which we can identify the very olive trees under which, midway on the slope between the town above and the Fountain of the Virgin below, our tents were pitched, and where the writer of this notice came near dying of a sudden and violent illness, such as sometimes seizes travelers in oriental lands, and such as cost the lives of two daughters of President Woolsey, of Yale College, on their Holy Land tour. Under those olive trees we lay awake all night with fever and heard the women and girls go down to the Well of Mary and back again up the hill with their water jars upon head or shoulder, chatting and laughing as they went. Upon those hill slopes Jesus spent his boyhood, and to that exhaustless fountain at the foot he no doubt often went to drink. It is in oriental countries that one learns the supreme value of a well. Here on page 143 is the city of Shechem—Nablous, it is now called—lying in the sweet, narrow, verdurous valley which runs in between Gerizim and Ebal, and which, when we saw it, was fragrant and bright with blossoms and musical with clear, cool waterbrooks. There it was that the lepers turned our stomach and nearly made us lose the breakfast we had just swallowed by fluttering around our tents and showing us their sores as we rose from the table. And away yonder, invisible in the distance, is Jacob's well, where the snake charmer let loose his crawling reptiles and sent a chill of horror through our reverent musing about our Saviour's interview with the Samaritan woman beside that well, and about the living water of which Christ himself is the fountain. Here is the Damascus gate of Jerusalem out of which Saul of Tarsus went northward on his furious errand, breathing out threatenings and slaughter, on his way to meet the Lord and be transformed into Paul the apostle and slave of Jesus Christ. Outside this gate we encamped on a slight eminence which is by some regarded as the place of the crucifixion. Loitering through these pages, with much lingering over remembered scenes, we have as good as gone through the Holy Land and Egypt again, without the fatigue and expense. Before or after travel, or in lieu of it, such a book is interesting, helpful, delightful. All who intend visiting the Holy Land should go soon. Each year the modernization of the land diminishes the harmony between the sacred ancient history and its scenic setting.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*The Vision of Christ in the Poets.* Selected Studies of the Christian Faith, as Interpreted by Milton, Wordsworth, the Brownings, Tennyson, Whittier, Longfellow, Lowell. Edited by CHARLES M. STUART. With an Introduction by Professor C. W. PEARSON, of Northwestern University. 16mo, pp. 304.

*The Social Law of Service.* By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science, and History in the University of Wisconsin. 16mo, pp. 276.

*Torchbearers of Christendom.* The Light they Shed and the Shadows they Cast. By ROBERT REMINGTON DOHERTY. 16mo, pp. 288.

*In League with Israel.* A Tale of the Chattanooga Conference. By ANNIE FELLOWS JOHNSTON, Author of *Joel: a Boy of Galilee*, *The Story of the Resurrection*, *Big Brother*, *The Little Colonel*. 16mo, pp. 303.

The above four volumes compose the "Epworth League Reading Course" for the present year, and are published in New York by Eaton & Mains, and in Cincinnati by Curtis & Jennings. The regular price of the set is \$3.80; but they are sent to Epworth Leaguers for \$2, with thirty-four cents in addition for postage or expressage. *The Vision of Christ in the Poets* consists of selections dealing with the Christian life. If some of them bear somewhat remotely upon Christ himself or the more spiritual phases of the Christ-life, yet all the selections are beautiful on their own account and contain teachings which will encourage and strengthen the young soldier in the Christian warfare. Certainly Browning's "Saul" and "Epistle from Kharshish," for example, and Lowell's "Glance behind the Curtain" can do only good to young or old. We can hardly commend the title of the book as denoting always the strict nature of its contents, but can conscientiously recommend the book itself. *The Social Law of Service* is a series of papers upon social and economic topics written in an entirely Christian spirit. Best of all for their purpose, they are decidedly practical and helpful; and those who know Professor Ely's rank among the expounders of sociological truth—and who does not know?—will not fail to see, underlying his more popular treatment, the wisdom and skill of the master. *In League with Israel* is a story of a young Hebrew who happens being in Chattanooga during the International Epworth League Convention of the year before last and is led to attend the "sunrise prayer meeting" upon the heights of Lookout Mountain. How he is brought into the Christian faith is designed to inspire Epworth Leaguers to seek to bring other Hebrews to a knowledge of their true Messiah. Dr. Doherty's *Torchbearers of Christendom* is much more than a mere summary of the history of the Christian Church. He has made it thoroughly alive by his treatment. The salient facts of Church history are grouped about the great leaders of successive religious movements; and the author's artistic arrangement of his material, his clear common sense, and his singular felicity and grace of expression make the book not only fascinating, but of permanent value. Those who know best his exceptional capabilities for effective literary work know what the reading public has lost through his hitherto almost unbroken silence in the purely literary field.



William Henry Seward. By THORNTON KIRKLAND LOTHROP. 16mo, pp. 446. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

This volume of the "American Statesmen" series is a political biography pure and simple, with just enough of the personal element in it to make us know the man whose political fortunes we are following. It covers an eventful period in our national life—a period saturated with passion and strife, a period on which posterity has hardly learned even now to look without a renewal of the old bitter sectional and party prejudice. Amid the dangerous rocks and shoals of that tumultuous time our author steers a steady and consistent course, guided by the same principles for which Seward and his party stood. Seward entered the national arena, as a Whig United States senator, at the time when the Whigs, although just invested with power, were rapidly going to pieces on the great rock of slavery. The elections of 1849 had returned a Whig majority to the lower house of Congress; yet so were the Whigs divided on the all-absorbing question that they were unable to combine on any candidate for speaker, and, after nearly three weeks of bickering and on the sixty-third ballot, a Democrat was chosen to preside over a nominally Whig House. The Whig party went down in the storms which followed the Mexican cessions of territory. In its place arose the new Republican party, in which from the very first Seward was an acknowledged and, perhaps, the most prominent leader; and had it not been for Greeley's hostility he might, and probably would, have received the Republican presidential nomination in 1860. Instead, he served for eight years as Secretary of State, entering the cabinet of one President with hesitation, and remaining in that of another with reluctance. His name will remain forever associated with the Trent affair. It is hardly possible that anyone can read this volume without recognizing how unwise and unjustifiable—even though so natural—was Captain Wilkes's impetuous action in seizing the two Confederate commissioners. For this Wilkes had received the thanks of the Secretary of the Navy and one branch of Congress. Even Lincoln himself was much indisposed to surrender the two prisoners of war; and it required all Seward's powers to convince the President and save the nation. "From the whole transaction," says Mr. Lothrop, "we gained this advantage—that the surrendering of these men so promptly and with so little discussion made both the ministry and the people of England ashamed of their violence and haste; and Messrs. Mason and Slidell, instead of being England's heroes, became her, and not our, 'white elephants.'" Mr. Seward sided with President Johnson in his plans of reconstruction, and thereby gained for himself much contemporary abuse; but the smoke of that mighty controversy has nearly cleared away, and it is possible now to see clearly on which side justice and expediency lay. This book is a positively useful monograph on one of the great actors in American history. We would especially call attention to the following sentence from p. 310: "Had the rebellion been crushed quickly, slavery, the cause of all our trouble, would have remained, and sooner or later the battle would have had to be fought over again."

